AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. II.—MAY, 1890.—NO. 5.

IS "PRIVATE EXPOSITION OF THE M. BL. SACRAMENT" A FORGOTTEN DEVOTION?

THE canons of Ecclesiastical discipline state that the Bl. Sacrament is not to be publicly exposed except for grave reasons and with the permission of the Ordinary.[1] By universal sanction and local statute certain days are set apart in every diocese, on which the Bl. Sacrament may be publicly exposed, provided there be a sufficiently large gathering of the faithful, and nothing wanting to perform the sacred function with due solemnity as regards liturgical chant, light, incense, vestments, servers, and whatever else is prescribed by the rubrics of the Ritual. In the United States solemn exposition of the Bl. Sacrament is permitted in every church and in the oratories of Religious, on all Sundays and holy-days of obligation; on all feasts of double rite I and II class, even though they are not holy-days of obligation; during the octave of Corpus Christi; twice every week in Lent; on each day during the time of a mission; on the feast of the Sacred Heart; during the Forty Hours' devotion; every day during the month of October in conjunction

[1] Expositio SS. Sacramenti facienda non est nisi ob causam publicam et gravem. S. C. Ep. 1 Sept. 1598.—Non licet sine licentia Episcopi ex levi causa publice exponere SS. Sacramentum. S. R. C. 12 June 1627. Decr. authent., n. 691.

with the Rosary devotions ordered by the present Sovereign Pontiff; finaliy, on all such days as the Ordinary may designate or sanction.[1]

Gardellini, in his commentary on the Clementine Instruction, dwells with emphasis upon the restrictions of the Sovereign Pontiff and the Sacred Congregations by which pastors of churches are warned against the too frequent public exposition of the M. Bl. Sacrament, lest the reverence due to the Sacred Mystery be thus lessened instead of being increased. "*Multo melius est, ut non ita frequenter exponatur, et tunc cum debita reverentia, quam ut frequentius et sine debito obsequio et reverentiæ significatione id fiat.*"[2] And again: "*Ordinarii locorum licentiam non debent impertiri, nisi aut certi sint, quod debita cum reverentia sacra illa functio peragatur, aut præscribant modum, quo peragenda sit, quin ab eo liceat declinare.*"[3] In exceptional cases only can solemn Benediction be given twice on the same day in any one church; always, however, with the express sanction of the Ordinary.

Whilst these limitations are of strict binding force, and intended to guard the reverence of the faithful for it, it is nevertheless a fact, that our Catholic people look upon exposition of the Bl. Sacrament as an almost essential portion of all public devotions. The Real Presence is the secret which draws them to the church, and indeed the beauty and attractiveness of our temples and shrines has no other sense than to point out the fact that they are truly the tabernacle of the Most High, Who speaks to His people there face to face. Even the most eloquent sermon of the preacher seems lacking in something if not followed by Benediction, and all other devotions could be satisfied in our homes but for the blessing that comes to us afterward from the Saviour awaiting His burdened people upon the sacred mountain of the Christian altar. What are we to do? Can we allow those many beautiful devotions, which are so helpful in keeping

[1] Cf. Decreta Conc. Plen. Balt. II.

[2] Comm. ad Instr. Clem. XXXVI., n. 5.

[3] Ibid.

alive the spirit of faith and gratitude, and which have been sanctioned and are urged by the Church, to go into desuetude because we find it difficult to bring our people together for the practice of them in the church unless we can have solemn Benediction at these times? On the other hand, even if the Bishop gave permission to have the public exposition on all occasions when a certain number of the faithful would join in special devotion, as during the afternoons or evenings of the months consecrated to the Sacred Heart, the M. Precious Blood, Our Bl. Lady, the Poor Souls, etc., the priest is frequently handicapped by the necessary absence of choir or organist, or servers, from performing the service with the solemn ceremonial required by the rubrics.—There is, however, a means to satisfy the devotion of our people and at the same time to free a priest from all embarrassing circumstances in connection with it. This is what in liturgical language is called *private exposition of the M. Bl. Sacrament.* At one time it was in common use in the Catholic Church. To day it is still practised in some parts of Italy, France, Canada, and wherever the excellent society of "Prêtres Adorateurs," who make its practice and propagation their special object, exists.

PRIVATE EXPOSITION OF THE M. BL. SACRAMENT.

This form of exposition, the manner of which will be directly described, has the time-honored sanction of the Church and is treated of in her liturgical books. Its advantages are the following: It requires no special permission of the Bishop; it can be given at any time and to any number, however small, of persons; it can dispense, if necessary, with chant, incense, servers, and other ceremonial requisites; it requires no particular form of prayers, nor any other reason for imparting it than the devotion of the faithful or the willingness of a priest to give the time, short or long as he may wish, during which it lasts. Some of the objects specified for which it may be given are the conversion of sinners, re-

covery of the sick, return of thanks for special graces, reparation of scandals, etc., even if but one person ask for the privilege. It may be announced to the people as taking place at stated times, whether it be to interest them in any particular good work, or simply to animate their faith and devotion.

The private exposition of the M. Bl. Sacrament is so called because the Sacred Host is not openly exposed, but veiled, or according to others, because it requires no grave reason, but may be done from motives of private devotion.[1] The following is the manner of performing the ceremony:—

Six or more wax candles are lighted upon the altar of the Bl. Sacrament.[2] A priest, vested in surplice and stole,[3] takes the Tabernacle key and with folded hands and head covered with the biretum goes to the foot of the altar. Here he genuflects, then ascends the altar, opens the Tabernacle, genuflects and moves the pyxis (ciborium) containing the M. Bl. Sacrament close to the door, so that it may be seen by the faithful. He is not permitted to take it out of the Tabernacle. "Si quandocumque privata ex causa Sacrosancta Eucharistia exponenda videbitur, a Tabernaculo nunquam extrahatur, sed in Pyxide velata, in aperto ejusdem Tabernaculi ostiolo.... collocetur."[4] He then genuflects on one knee, descends to the foot of the altar, and incenses, if possible, the Bl. Sacrament.[5] He can then recite prayers in the Vernacular, so that the people may join in them. At the

[1] Cum nullis Ecclesiæ legibus, publica causa et Episcopi facultas necessario requirantur. Inst. Clem., l. c. n. 10.

[2] Cum numero convenienti luminum. S. C. Ep. 1 Sep. 1598. Cum *sex saltem* luminibus *cereis*. S. C. Ep. 9 Dec. 1602.

[3] Although the Decrees say simply "cum assistentia alicujus sacerdotis stola et superpelliceo induti," the stole should ordinarily be white. The cope is *not* to be used.

[4] S. C. Conc. 17 Aug. 1630; Cf. Instr. Clem. l. c. n. 11.

[5] Although the incensing is not obligatory, Cavalieri, cited by Gardellini, says: Expositio et repositio hujusmodi, quamvis Sacramentum e Tabernaculo non extrahatur, fiet ritu ordinario, nempe cum incensatione, genuflexionibus, aliisque, etc.—l. c. n. 25.

end it would be proper to sing or say the "Tantum Ergo," the Versicle "Panem de cœlo" and the oration "Deus qui nobis sub sacramento mirabili." He may add to this the prayer "Pro quacumque necessitate," or any other found in the missal and corresponding to the character of the devotion.[1] The adoration finished, the priest ascends the altar, genuflects on one knee, removes the Pyxis back to its place, genuflects, and closes the Tabernacle. He may then give the blessing from the altar: "Benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos et maneat semper," making the sign of the cross with his hand over the people. But it is never allowed on these occasions to give the blessing to the people with the Pyxis, as is done when the Bl. Sacrament is carried to the sick. "*Non licet* Sacram Pyxidem e Tabernaculo extrahere et cum ea *benedictionem populo impertiri*."[2] To do this requires an acknowledged custom[3] or a special privilege, which has been rarely accorded by the Sovereign Pontiff. One instance of it in recent times is the concession made by Leo XIII at the request of the sacred Congregation in behalf of poor churches, where the October devotions of the M. H. Rosary cannot be performed with the requisite solemnity prescribed for public exposition by the Ritual.[4] This applies *only* to the October devotions and to poor churches, and is an exceptional privilege not to be used without the sanction of the Ordinary, nor to be extended to other times and places.[5] Thus we are enabled without inconvenience to satisfy the devotion of our people at all times, and to bring together at

[1] "Post orationem consuetam SSi. Sacramenti addi poterit collecta pro ingruenti necessitate." Cav. l. c.

[2] Instr. Clem. l. c. n. 26. [3] S. R. C. 16 Jan. 1886.

[4] Cf. *American Eccl. Review*, Sept. 1889, page 353.

[5] Attentis specialibus circumstantiis ecclesiarum pauperum in quibus præscripta expositio SS. Sacramenti solemni modo seu per ostensorium fieri nequeat absque incommodo, eadem *per modum exceptionis* peragi poterit, prudenti judicio Ordinarii, cum sacra Pyxide, aperiendo scilicet ab initio ostiolum ciborii et cum ea populum in fine benedicendo. Die 4 Feb. 1886. Dec. auth. 5957 ad IV.

least a few who during those special seasons of grace will cooperate with us in building up the strong walls of the parish, which are the piety of its faithful children offering glory, love, reparation to Him Who dwells in the midst of us, the Holy One of Israel, Our Saviour.

THE SIMULTANEOUS METHOD IN TEACHING.

Management of Christian Schools. By the Brothers of the Christian Schools. New York, 1887.

A History of Education. By F. V. N. Painter. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1887.

DR. W. T. Harris conceived the happy idea of editing an international educational series of books on the same plan as the well-known international scientific series published by the Appletons. This volume of Prof. Painter's is a contribution to the series. We regret that we cannot recommend the volume to our Catholic readers. It is evidently modelled after the *Histoire Universelle de la Pédagogie* of Paroz. But our recollections of Paroz's volume are that it was far more fair-spoken than the one before us. Had the professor contented himself with translating Paroz, he would have given us a better book. In treating Catholic education, he has imported into his work all the bile and bitterness of Raumer. But scant justice is consequently done to the grand rôle played by the Church and by great Catholic educators in the work of education. If Fénelon is praised it is because the professor has mistaken him for a Jansenist. We do not accuse the author of deliberately misrepresenting us. In all probability he never set foot within a Catholic institution; still less likely is it that he ever made a careful study of our Catholic schools and their methods. The sources from which he drew were poisoned. "It was in the library of the university of Bonn," he tells us, "nearly four

years ago, as I sat before an alcove of educational works and leisurely examined the admirable histories by Raumer and Karl Schmidt, that the thought and purpose of preparing this work were first conceived.[1] Later on he acknowledges his indebtedness to these works. Most valuable aids they are to the student of pedagogy, when he has antidotes to counteract the bigotry and prejudice pervading them. Pity it was he did not give more attention to Stöckl, and the great work of Father Denifle, then just published.

The author's omissions in treating his subject are conspicuous. He ignores the educational development of Spain, and yet La Fuente, among others, would have enlightened him upon the great part Spain took in the education of Europe. He has no word upon the educational progress of Italy. A glance at Tiraboschi would have shown him the magnitude of Italy's claims as an educator. The smaller works of Everardo Michele, Ceruti, and Milanese would have brought the subject home to him still more directly. True, all three are Catholic writers, but we can assure him that they are none the less trustworthy. Even when treating of education in France, the professor finds no place for the work of Blessed de la Salle. And yet, in another volume of this same series, we find that educator characterized as follows: "A man of progressive, modern thought, he introduced, besides normal schools, gradation and object-lessons, and established industrial schools, polytechnic institutes, and reformatories."[2] Blessed de la Salle is especially identified with the Simultaneous Method. It shall be the purpose of the present paper to trace this method from its first dawnings to its full application by Blessed de la Salle. It is a study that has not been made in any pedagogical work that has come under our notice; it therefore cannot fail to interest the educator.

[1] Preface.

[2] Boone: *Education in the United States*, p. 126.

I.

First, let us explain what is meant by the Simultaneous Method. There are three recognized methods of teaching. The first is that of hearing and explaining the lesson of each child apart, while the others may be studying. It is called the Individual Method. The second is that of having the more advanced pupils in a class to teach the less advanced ones under the general supervision of the master. This method was brought from India by Bell and was popularized by Lancaster. It is known as the Mutual Method. The third is that of grading the children according to their capacity, putting those of the same capacity in the same class, and having them to use the same book and follow the same lesson under one and the same master. It is the Simultaneous Method. Now, all teaching is done by one or other of these methods, separately or combined.[1] But at the present day, the method most in vogue, and which has best stood the test of time and experience, is that with which the Brothers of the Christian Schools are identified, and which is known as the Simultaneous Method.

Like all fruitful ideas, the Simultaneous Method is not the exclusive property of any one man. Others discerned its value, and even partially applied its principle, long before Blessed de la Salle made it live in his work. We do not find it in the University methods of the middle ages. The mere listening to a lecture, taking notes upon it, and holding disputations over it, is far different from the Simultaneous Method. Nor does it seem to have been followed in the Grammar Schools. We cannot recognize it in the picture of them that Erasmus has transmitted to us. Here is the unsympathetic manner in which he speaks of the grammarians of his boyhood: "A race, of all men the most miserable, who grow old at their work, surrounded by herds of boys, deafened by continual uproar, and poisoned by a close, foul atmosphere; satisfied, however, so long as they can over-

[1] See Management of Christian Schools, p. 34.

awe the terrified throng by the terrors of their look and speech, and while they cut them to pieces with ferule, birch, and thong, gratify their own merciless natures at pleasure." [1]

The Jesuits organized each class in subdivisions; each subdivision being headed by an advanced pupil called a *decurion*, to whom the boys recited their lessons at stated times, while the master corrected exercises or heard the lessons of special boys. The whole class afterwards received explanations from the master. Order and discipline reigned. Emulation prevailed. The picture drawn by Erasmus became an impossibility in their schools. But this is not the Simultaneous Method. And above all, it only slowly dawned upon the masters of the primary schools to introduce these improvements into their methods of teaching. Theirs was exclusively the Individual Method. Each pupil passed in turn before the master, said his lesson, returned to his place, and moped, or studied, or amused himself as best it pleased him or as dread of the birch permitted. Such a system necessarily brought with it disorder and confusion in the school, and led to loss of time on the part of the scholar. The consequent evil was irreparable for the poor child, whose school-days were limited. He quitted school, fortunate if he had learned his catechism and how to spell through his Psalter; rarely fortunate if he had advanced sufficiently to read in his mother-tongue and to write a letter. The child preparing for college spent seven or eight years endeavoring to learn that which might have been mastered in half the time.

In 1610, the evils of the system are spoken of in a memorial dealing with the government of the University. It is beginning to dawn upon men's mind that the old way might not, after all, be the best way. This memorial is the first emphatic protest in France that we have come across

[1] *Encomium Moriæ*. We must remember that Erasmus, like Luis Vives, is a reactionist against the old methods and an enthusiastic admirer of the New Learning. Allowance should be made for their exaggerated statements as reactionists.

against the old way. The memorialist feels the necessity of some method for regulating the studies and the teaching of children, and for preparing youths better for their University course. "Since our members," says he, "depend principally upon the primary institutions, just as good health and natural complexion depend upon the milk we take in infancy, it is due to the prudence of the Magistrate, with the aid and counsel of experts, to provide some method to be used in the education of the children; for doctrine without method is like a torch under a barrel, consuming itself without giving out a profitable light."[1] He sees no reason why children might not learn in four years all that, in his day, it took them eight or nine to learn. He appeals to experienced teachers to devise some means out of this roundabout method, which consumes so much valuable time.[2] To realize an evil is one thing; to remedy it is quite another. The University was too taken up with the struggle for its own existence against the encroachments of the separate collegiate system, to occupy itself with elementary schools. The evil grew apace. Elementary education in France reached its lowest degree of confusion during the first half of the seventeenth century.[3] The numerous wars of this period left little time and less inclination for the cultivation of peaceful pursuits. The eyes of the natural custodians of society were so dimmed by the dazzling brilliancy of the court of the Grand Monarch, they could no longer perceive the evils festering at their own doors.

II.

Blessed Peter Fourier (1565–1640) saw in Christian education the remedy for many of the disorders existing among

[1] Mémoires pour le Règlement de l'Université. 1610. Bibl. nat. Printed Matter. Paris Université (Generalités). 1073. 24 115-2130, p. 17.

[2] Ibid. p. 19.

[3] Boutiot, Histoire de l'Instruction publique et populaire à Troyes pendant les quatre derniers siècles. Troyes, 1865. p. 9.

the poor and the laboring class.[1] He was a far-seeing man, and anticipated more than one of our modern social improvements. In 1597, he attempted to organize a religious teaching order for boys. But the four young men whom he had brought together for the purpose abandoned him. The work was reserved for another no less worthy. However, Peter Fourier was more successful in organizing religious teachers for girls. Providence blessed and fructified his labors in this direction beyond his greatest hopes. He lived to see all Lorraine peopled by the Congregation of Notre Dame, which still remains a monument and a witness to his zeal and his enlightened views. He gave this sisterhood a rule and constitution. It was first printed in 1640. The second edition, bearing date of 1694, now lies before us.[2] Therein the saintly author lays down rules for the management of scholars, and methods of teaching such branches as are usually taught in elementary schools. To attempt to trace the history of pedagogy without allusion to this remarkable book is an unpardonable oversight. There is wisdom in every line. It ranks by incontestable right and title the parish-priest of Mattaincourt among great educators. But even our Catholic historians of pedagogy do but scant justice to the Blessed Peter Fourier. Stöckl[3] simply touches upon the personality of the man, and dismisses his works with a hasty notice of the Congregation of Notre Dame. Not a word has he about the method embodied in the *Constitutions*. And yet, the analysis of that method would not have been unworthy of a Stöckl. We shall note its salient points.

The principle of the Simultaneous Method is, for the first time, clearly stated: "The inspectress, or the mistress of

[1] Rev. P. Jean Bedel, *La Vie du Rev. Pierre Fourier*. Paris, 1666.

[2] *Les vraies Constitutions des Religieuses de la Congregation de Nostre Dame*. Séconde Edition. A Toul, 1694. At the end of the volume we read: La présente copie des *Constitutions*. . . . a été fidèlement extraite sur son vray original sain et entier, et écript de sa propre main, et se conforme de mots à autres, par le subscript Notaire Apostolique. Ainsi signé, F. Tabourin.

[3] Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Pädagogik, p. 339.

class, shall endeavor, as far as it possibly can be carried out, that all the pupils of the same mistress have each the same book, in order to learn and read therein all together the same lesson; so that, whilst one is reading hers in an audible and intelligible voice before the mistress, all the others, hearing her and following this lesson in their books at the same time, may learn it sooner, more readily, and more perfectly."[1] Read it how we may, it is the principle of the Simultaneous Method whole and entire. And yet, when this great man — who was in advance of his age upon every subject that he touched — entered into details of practice, he lost sight of the principle which he had laid down. In the very next paragraph, it is regulated that the mistress call up two pupils at the time and place them one at each side of her seat. Then, the author continues: "The more advanced shall read her lesson; the other shall listen to her, shall correct all the faults she may make, whether in using the wrong words, or in pronouncing badly, or in not making the proper pauses. When she has finished her lesson, the other one shall read hers, and her companion shall likewise correct all her mistakes."[2] These two having read, two others shall come forward, and so on till the class is all heard. And here enters a rule that throws light on the source whence the European peasantry imbibed that gentleness and urbanity for which they are noted: "According to the number of mistakes she has made, she shall say an *Ave Maria* for the companion who has corrected her."[3]

Elsewhere in the same chapter we read: "If any mistakes are made in reading, and they are not corrected by the companions of the readers — *leurs compagnes apariées* — the mistress shall gently correct them at the time."[4] The nearest the saintly author comes in practice to the Simultaneous Method is when, speaking of the younger children, he says: "In order the more easily to make the very young children

[1] *Constitutions*, p. iii., ch. xi. sec. 6, p. 54.
[2] Ibid., sec. 7, p. 54. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. sec. 2, p. 52.

profit of the lesson, the mistress shall take four or six at the time, of about equal capacity, and while one is reading, the other five shall follow in their books, saying after her the same words in a low tone."[1] With beginners, he would have the Simultaneous Method practised on particular occasions: "Sometimes they shall be exercised all together, by pointing out to them on a large card, and making them say, all the letters in a syllable and all the syllables in a word."[2] Again Blessed Fourier devotes a special chapter to his method. The chapter is an admirable one. It grades the school into three chief divisions;[3] it assigns special teachers to each bench when there is need for them;[4] it places pupils of the same capacity on the same bench;[5] it attempts to inspire at the same time devotion to the Blessed Virgin and an *esprit de corps* among the pupils of the same bench, by putting each under the patronage of Our Blessed Lady according to her feasts;[6] it seeks to create emulation by having a bench of honor and a bench of disgrace.[7] Here, also, the method that runs through the whole book—the method that is peculiar to Blessed Fourier—is distinctly stated: "*Each mistress shall pair all her pupils, placing them two by two, one with the other;* placing together those most alike, not in age, or quality, or affection, but in knowledge; in order that they may hear and correct each other, and piously compete for the first place, in recitation of prayers and catechism, and in reading."[8]

Such is the method of Blessed Peter Fourier. Sometimes he would exercise a class of beginners all together from large reading cards hung up in a conspicuous place; sometimes he would have all those learning to spell to work together under the dictation of the same mistress; sometimes he would have the more advanced, when learning to read Latin, brought before the teachers in groups of four or six at the

[1] Ibid., sec. 4, p 53. [2] Ibid., p 53. [3] Chap. vi., sec. 2, p. 19.
[4] Ibid., sec. 7, p. 20. [5] Ibid., sec. 7, p. 20. [6] Sec. 8, p. 21.
[7] Ibid., sec. 11, pp. 22, 23, 24. [8] Chap. vi., sec. 10, pp. 21, 22.

time; always he would have the most advanced pupils heard two by two, each reciprocating the corrections of the others. This is indeed a great improvement upon the Individual Method. We are greatly indebted to Abbé Pierfitte [1] and to M. G. Du Bois [2] for having called the attention of the pedagogical world to the rich treasures contained in the *Constitutions*. But when they tell us that this is the Simultaneous Method pure and simple, they are calling it that which it is not. Equally great a misnomer is it to call the act of two children correcting each other under the eye of a teacher the Mutual Method. The essence of the Mutual Method is the dispensing with the teacher altogether. It is the pupil instructing the pupil. In the method of Peter Fourier it is still the teacher who instructs. The pupil's corrections are only for the purpose of keeping up attention. We may well call that method the Reciprocal Method. It is this method we find recommended in the teacher's manual for the city of Paris, the *Ecole Paroissiale*, edition of 1654: "Those who go to the master to read shall present themselves *but two at a time*. . . . The master shall call the writers to his desk, *two by two*, to correct their exercises." [3]

III.

Another thinker and educator, in another part of Europe, about the same time, in the midst of wanderings and persecutions, sought to solve the problem of educating the greatest number, in the least time, and with the smallest pains. Komensky (1592–1671) [4] was an ardent admirer of Bacon, and applied his inductive method to its solution. From the

[1] Paper read before the Congress of Blois, 1884.

[2] L'Univers, Dec. 17, 1887.

[3] 3me partie, chap. iv.

[4] Komensky—Comenius—takes his name from his native village of Komna, in Moravia. He suppressed his family name on account of the persecutions to which he was subjected as a Moravian bishop. He held wild philosophic vagaries, which he pretended to draw from the Old Testament. (See Franck, *Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques*, Art. Comenius)

physical world he drew analogies for the intellectual world. This led him to fanciful and extravagant inferences. But he was observant; he learned much from the systems of others, and feared not to borrow from them whatever he considered good and useful. Upon the *Janua Linguarum* of Father Bathe of the Irish College at Salamanca—a book which had been translated into eight languages by 1629—he modelled, even to the very name, his more popular *Janua Linguarum Reserata.*[1] From Ratich he learned to unite the study of words with the study of things. From the *Ratio Studiorum* he inserted many a detail of practice and principle in his *Didactica Magna.*

Komensky asks: "How can one teacher suffice for any number of pupils whatever?" He replies by saying that not only can he suffice, but that it is for the benefit of the class that there be a large number, inasmuch as it excites sympathy and emulation.[2] As the sun sheds its rays upon the whole earth, so should the master instruct his whole class; each and all, intent of eyes and ears and minds, receiving from him whatever instruction he imparts. Therefore he should not instruct single pupils privately, outside of school-hours, nor publicly in school, but—*omnes simul et semel*—all together at one and the same time.[3] All of the same capacity should have the same book. All should listen in silence to the master. In order to lessen the fatigue of the master, he should be assisted by *decurions* in correcting the exercises. That he may control the attention of his pupils, he should frequently question them promiscuously on what has been said.[4] One teacher, one book, one lesson for all in the same grade: this is an approximation to the Simultaneous Method. Charles Hoole (1610-1666) intro-

[1] "Inasmuch as they (the Jesuits) were the prime inventors, we thankfully acknowledge it." Preface to Anchoran's translation, 1639. See Quick's *Educational Reformers*, pp. 63-65.

[2] See S. S. Laurie, *John Amos Comenius*, p. 105. Eng. Ed.

[3] *Didactica Magna*, Amsterdam, 1657. Col. 103.

[4] Ibid., col. 104. His whole method is embodied in chap. xix.

duced this method of Komensky into England with most success.[1] His school was efficient and a model of good order. He attempted to propagate the method in a little work called *The New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching.*[2] But the method did not take root in England. Indeed, the influence of Komensky was not lasting. Rousseau and Pestalozzi followed in his track, and unawares re-discovered many of his principles. "Comenius," says Buisson, "established nothing durable and definite; he was simply an admirable precursor."[3] The only part of his system that has survived, may be summed up in the formula: "Let all things be taught to all." Now this is an educational fallacy. The mind simply stuffed with facts is not an educated mind. The mind so trained and disciplined that it knows how to use its knowledge to purpose and advantage, is alone the truly cultured mind.[4]

Mgr. de Nesmond (1629–1715), Bishop of Bayeux, independently of Komensky, was working at the same problem of method. In 1672, he distributed among his clergy a *Plan of Instruction and Education for Primary Schools.*[5] We have before us, for our use, a beautiful copy, bound in vellum, of the Pastoral and the Method. The Pastoral bewails the absence of schools and the lack of competent masters. It recites the strenuous efforts made by the early Fathers and the Councils of the Church in behalf of Christian education. It prohibits the holding of schools in churches and chapels.[6] This was at one time a general custom in country places and villages.

Next comes the bishop's method. He wrote it in answer to the question: How may large classes be taught in a short time by a single master? He enters into so many

[1] Quarterly Journal of Education, 1867, p. 262.

[2] There is a copy of this rare book in the Bodleian Library.

[3] *Dictionnaire de Pédagogie*, Art. Comenius.

[4] See S. S. Laurie on Comenius, p. 220.

[5] *Dict. de Péd.*, Art. Nesmond.

[6] Ordonnance 1662, p. 56.

practical details, and puts such good sense into all he says, one feels that if he were not a bishop he might have become an eminent educator. In the first place, he would classify all the children of the school. "The master shall divide his school into four or five benches, according to the number and capacity of his scholars." [1] He then assigns to each bench the children occupied with the same subject. The division is instructive as revealing an order of things different from that prevailing to-day. The most advanced scholars are placed on the first bench, and they are supposed to learn how to read French and manuscripts, and how to write and work arithmetic. In the second bench are placed "those who read passably well in their Hours." The book of Hours contained certain offices of the Church in Latin, and the child was to read therein before he had learned to read in his mother-tongue. A few years later, Blessed de la Salle —amid much opposition and many protests from bishops and clergy—introduced the method of teaching the child to read his mother-tongue before reading the Latin.

In the next place, to each bench he would assign the same book. "We give the same book to each bench," he says, "simply in order that all the children on that bench may receive the same lesson, and when one begins to read, the others may read in a low voice at the same time." [2] This is a decided improvement on Peter Fourier's system of reading by two's. Like Komensky, Mgr. de Nesmond goes to the root of the difficulty connected with this method, by showing how the children's attention is to be sustained; for, he adds in another place, without this attention, "the method would not only be a delusion, but irksome, and even unbearable." [3] The means he would adopt is the only rational one: "And in order to oblige those children—who should all have the same lesson and the same book—to read in a low tone of voice what one of their companions reads aloud, it were well

[1] *Méthode pour instruire en peu de Temps les Enfants*, p. 59.
[2] Ibid., p. 60. [3] Ibid., p. 65.

sometimes to take them by surprise, and to make those least expecting it continue the lesson."[1]

The wisdom of his remarks has not grown old. They are as true to-day as they were in his day. They apply as well to our class-rooms in America as to the little country-schools for which he was legislating. In order to awaken the child's intelligence, he suggests that the master be not too prompt in naming a word over which the child hesitates, but rather to let the child spell it and make it out for himself.[2] He would have the lessons short.[3] It is of great advantage for children to do a little and to do that little well.[4] Commence by the more advanced pupils, so that the others may learn from them, and that the former may be occupied during the remainder of the school-hours in writing and arithmetic.[5]

The daily regulation is no less instructive. It reveals customs that are gone out of use. School opens at seven in summer and at eight in winter. The scholars bring their breakfast with them. They are taken to Mass two by two. Upon returning to the school, they shall say grace before breakfast, standing; during the meal, one of the more advanced scholars shall make public reading either from the Lives of the Saints or some othe pious book, unless the master himself should choose to entertain them with their defects or their duties.[6] Here the page is lit up with a beautiful trait of Christian charity. It is recommended that a pupil go around with a basket and collect food for the poor scholars having none, taking care that insinuating or flattering children do not deprive themselves in order to gain the good graces of the master or of him making the collection. To this little touch of nature is added this other touch of grace: "And the poor shall say a *Pater* and *Ave* for those among their companions who have acted so charitably."[7] La Salle regulated the matter after a more gentle manner— and one less calculated to take away the merit of

[1] *Méthode*, p. 64 [2] Ibid., p. 65. [3] Ibid., p. 66.
[4] Ibid., p. 68. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid., p. 72. [7] Ibid., p. 75.

the act of charity by vanity or other human motive. The master should see that the pupils bring some breakfast, without however forcing them to do so. A basket is placed in the corner for whatever the children cannot use. This is distributed to the poor children who have come without any breakfast, and the master shall exhort them to pray to God for their benefactors. They must understand, furthermore, that if they are allowed to eat in school "it is that they may learn to eat with wisdom, modesty, and in a becoming manner, and to pray to God before and after their meal."[1] All this brings us back to other days, when poverty was generally allied to scholarship. In the fourteenth century we find the children of the College called Bons Enfants going out daily to beg for their sustenance.[2]

In the fifteenth century the poor students of Montaigu College went to the neighboring Carthusian monastery to beg their daily pittance with the other indigent poor. We know how mercilessly Rabelais lashes these Montaigu sparrow-hawks—*esparviers de Montaigu*—as he calls them.[3] The spirit of charity and prayerfulness reigned everywhere during these ages of faith, and healed the misery and supplied the indigence of poor master and poor scholar. These things are of the past; but they are the welding and cementing elements that have made of the past a strong foundation on which to build up the present and the future. This inculcating of charity and gentleness and unselfishness was the refining and educating factor in mediæval life.

But we cannot linger longer over the interesting little book of Mgr. de Nesmond. We have found it a precious landmark in the history of pedagogy. The author groups and classifies the scholars; with Peter Fourier, he gives

[1] *Conduite des Ecoles Chrétiennes.* 1720. Chap. ii., art. i., p. 8.

[2] *Dit des Crieries de Paris:*

"Les Bons-Enfans orrez crier:
Du pain! n'es veuil pas oublier."

[3] Gargantua, liv. I., ch. 37.

those on the same form the same book; with Komensky, he appoints officers to hear repetition of catechism, serving at Mass, and other memory-lessons, while a class is reading before the master; but he has not conceived the Simultaneous Method.

IV.

About 1675, Charles Demia, a zealous and enlightened priest, founder of the Brethren of St. Charles, drew up rules for the schools of the city and diocese of Lyons.[1] They run along the same lines as those of Mgr. de Nesmond. The scholars are divided up into bands according to their capacity. The more advanced pupils taught those less advanced. "M. Demia," says Ravelet, "had the intuition of the mutual system of teaching; at least he appealed to the good will of the older pupils, and established among them dignitaries who aided the master."[2] In his general remarks upon reading he lays stress: "1. That children of the same band be of the same capacity; 2. that they have the same book, in the same print, and the same lesson; 3. that each one follow, holding his finger or marker on the word that is being read."[3] He further introduced a system which Venerable Cæsar du Bus had borrowed from the Jesuits, and had applied to the free schools that he began to establish in 1592; namely, that of public disputation among the pupils on all the branches taught—catechism, arithmetic, spelling, politeness, and we are told, even "the method of making mental prayer"—those distinguishing themselves receiving clothes or other necessary articles according to their wants.

In this manner were earnest educators groping towards the light, and out of chaos seeking to make order. But these were the exceptional souls of this period. The large majority ran in the old grooves. Small pay-schools multiplied. Even

[1] *Règlements pour les Ecoles de la Ville et Diocèse de Lyon.*

[2] *Histoire du Vénérable J. B. de la Salle*, Ed. 1874, p. 64.

[3] Buisson, *Dict. de Pédagogie*, Art. *Lecture.*

many of the clergy, especially in country places, kept pay-schools for small boys, as a means of subsistence.[1] It had been decreed by law that no child should be retained in a private school beyond his ninth year completed.[2] But the statutes were ignored or defied. Boys were retained years beyond their limitations. Professors were engaged for various branches, and the private elementary school soon grew into an academy rivalling the University colleges. The University complained. Its halls were becoming deserted. We find it bringing action at law against that most active, most domineering, and most combative of Precentors, Claude Joly, for licensing so many small boarding-schools. In the course of its argument, the University says: "Method-mongers, like searchers after the philosopher's stone, have always been in vogue, but it does not seem that they ever succeed.... It is safer and more advantageous to have children pass regularly through the ordinary college classes. It may be longer, but it is surer."[3] The University here alludes to the charlatanism practised in many of these private schools. Every professor had his nostrum. Some pretended to be able to teach Latin in three months, and in six to have the student competent to interpret all classical authors.[4] Circulars as flaring as any of our own day were issued, announcing wonderful results and advertising for situations for students who should finish with the master.[5]

[1] See Babeau, *La Ville sous l'Ancien Régime*, p. 484.

[2] *Statutes Henri IV.*, 1598, Art. 10.

[3] *Factum* pour l'Université de Paris contre M. le Chantre de l'Eglise Cathédrale et ses Permissionaires tenans Ecole à Pensions. Seconde Partie. pp. 22 *seqq.* (Bibl. de l'Université. H. F. a. u. 9 1675-1677).

[4] Jourdain. *Histoire de l'Université de Paris*, p. 240. This, I dare say, was the foible of Ratich, which must have penetrated the schools of Paris about that time.

[5] Here is one snatched from oblivion: "L'orthographe françoise imprimée de puis peu, a rendu nos petits escoliers si sçavans dans l'orthographe, qu'ils sont tout prêts de combattre contre les plus grands maistr esde cet art, mesme avec party du double contre le simple. Le champ de bataille est ouvert à tous venans, et à toute heure.

"Si quelcun a besoin, pour son service, de petits garçons tout faits et bien in-

In spite of these strenuous efforts to introduce method into primary education, we still find the old disorderly ways prevailing. In the latter half of the seventeenth century, a voice in Paris cries out against the inhuman discipline to which young children are subjected in the primary schools. It is still another protest against the old, confusing, roundabout manner of teaching a school full of children one by one. It is the voice of an educator—evidently a layman—of forty years' experience, whose labors, he tells us, were found worthy of the approval of gentlemen of the University, of the Jesuit Fathers, and of the professors of St. Nicholas de Chardonnet. It is a memorial pleading for a school in which to apply the same principles that Komensky, Peter Fourier, Mgr. de Nesmond, and Charles Démia had applied—"proposing to myself," says the author, "no other end than the glory of my God, and asking no other reward than His mercy."[1]—The voice comes to us out of a miscellaneous collection of pamphlets of the seventeenth century. The collection is a recent acquisition of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. In the midst of school-boy exercises, by way of translations from French into Latin, a eulogy upon Henry of Matignon in 1658, an account of the canonization of Peter of Alcantara in 1671, and other tracts, is found this memorial, well written and clearly reasoned, but without name or date. M. Leopold Delisle, Director of the Library, kindly examined the pamphlet for us, and after carefully considering type, style, and matter, came to the conclusion that it could not be of later date than 1680. It certainly must have been prior to 1690, for by that time the method of Blessed de la Salle was becoming the admiration of the people and the envy of the schoolmasters of Paris.

struits dans le Christianisme, bons lecteurs, écrivains, et parfaits orthographes, nostre escole luy en fournira à son choix.

"C'est dans la rue Bourg-l'Abbé à l'escole de charité." Bibliothèque Mazarine. 274 A[13] in-fol.

[1] *Avis touchant les Petites Écoles.* Bibl. Nat. (p. Z. 320) p. 6.

The voice that speaks from the pamphlet has the ring of sincerity. After exposing the difficulties that beset children in their first attempts at learning, the anonymous author justly and considerately asks: "Were one designedly to oppose the good of children, and cause them to consume time uselessly and with great trouble, could one have acted otherwise?"[1] He sees students classified according to capacity in the colleges, and he wonders why no one thinks of applying the same method to the elementary schools. "Why," he asks, "are these little ones deprived of the light, the beauty, the comfort, and all the advantages that order and grading produce?[2] He pictures the ease with which a great number might be taught by the method in which "one master, one book, and one voice teach."[3] Farther on, in stating his method, the first principle which he lays down is the principle of the Simultaneous Method. "The primary school," he tells us, "should be so disposed that one and the same book, one and the same master, one and the same lesson, one and the same correction, should serve for all, so that each scholar would thereby possess his master wholly and entirely, and occupy all his care, all his time, and all his trouble."[4] Still, although the principle is clearly stated, when we remember what these little schools were, and how they contained all grades of scholars, from those learning their A B C out of their primer decorated with the sign of the Cross,[5] to those reading in manuscripts, we perceive at a glance the impossibility of carrying out this principle under a single master. The anonymous author does not get beyond the regulations laid down by Charles Demia and Mgr. de Nesmond. They also speak of one book and one master.

The voice is the voice of a precursor, feeling acutely the wants and shortcomings of his age in educational matters,

[1] *Avis*, p. 4. [2] Ibid., p. 13. [3] Ibid., p. 13. [4] Ibid., p. 19.

[5] Hence the name given to the child's Primer of that day: *Croix de par Dieu*; i. e., de parte Dei.

but unable to remedy them. He advocates strongly public examinations as a means of exciting emulation.[1] He considers such examinations a powerful corrective upon both teacher and pupil. He feels the necessity of training teachers before allowing them to assume charge of a school: "A shoemaker or blacksmith must learn his trade, but young men without experience, and who are themselves studying, are allowed to try their 'prentice-hand at the expense of those poor little ones."[2] At the very time that this cry is going up in Paris, a saintly priest is quietly evolving the solution to all these problems. In 1681, Blessed John Baptist de la Salle had organized the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and had given them the Simultaneous Method of teaching. What Blessed Peter Fourier touched; what Komensky, and Mgr. de Nesmond, and Charles Demia had glimmerings of; what the anonymous memorialist could nowhere find and thought to realize, had become a fact.

V.

There is no uncertainty about the language of Blessed de la Salle in regard to the method he would have his disciples follow. It is no longer a single master governing a whole school; it is two, three, or more, according to the number of pupils; each taking those of the same capacity and teaching them altogether. In order to give effect to this method he regulates the duty of the masters in their respective classes: "The Brothers shall pay particular attention to three things in the school-room: 1. During the lessons, to correct every word that the scholar who is reading pronounces badly; 2. to cause all who read in the same lesson to follow therein; 3. to have silence strictly observed in the school."[3] The pupils follow in the same lesson; they observe strict si-

[1] *Avis*, p. 10. [2] Ibid, p. 13.

[3] *Règles Communes des Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes.* Translation from the MS. of 1718, signed and authenticated by Brother Bartholomew, Second Superior-General.

lence; the master, in correcting one, is correcting all: here is the essence of the Simultaneous Method. Glancing over the pages of the admirable manual of school-management which Blessed de la Salle prepared, we find scattered through them this principle inspiring all the rules of wisdom and prudence in which the book abounds. In one place we read: "All the scholars in the same lesson shall follow together, without distinction or discernment, according as they shall be notified by the master."[1] On the page following it is said: "All the scholars in each lesson shall have the same book and shall be given the same lesson."[2] A few pages further on we find the same thing repeated: "All shall have but one lesson, and whilst one spells or reads, all the others shall follow, those who spell and read as well as those only reading."[3] Again he generalizes the principle for all the lessons: "In all the lessons from alphabet-cards, syllabaries, and other books, whether French or Latin, and even during arithmetic, while one reads, all the others of the same lesson shall follow; that is, they shall read to themselves from their books without making noise with their lips what the one reading pronounces aloud from his book."[4] Note the expressions: *in all the lessons. . . . all the others. . . . shall follow.* The four or six pupils of Peter Fourier, or the whole bench of children of Charles Demia and Mgr. Nesmond, following that which one is reading, whilst all the others are occupied as best they may, is a far different thing from that of the whole class following in silence the one who reads, whilst the master corrects, or has the pupils to correct, the mistakes that are made. In order to sustain the attention of the pupils, the saintly Founder would have him who is called upon to continue not to repeat a word or syllable that has been read.[5] With truth has Matthew Arnold said, in speaking of this

[1] *Conduite des Ecoles Chrétiennes.* Avignon. 1724. P. i., ch. iii., art. i., sect. i., p. 19.

[2] Ibid., p. 18. [3] Ibid., p. 33. [4] Ibid., p. 120.

[5] Ibid., p 10; See also p. 120.

handbook of methods: "Later works on the same subject have little improved the precepts, while they entirely lack the unction."[1]

We might quote pages from this precious hand-book, applying the Simultaneous Method to all the details of school-life with a precision and directness that bespeak the master-mind. But it is needless. The method has not only been embedded in a book; it has also been embodied in a living organism, that has preserved its traditions with the greatest fidelity, and that still applies them the world over. Because we all of us have been trained according to this method, and see it practised in nearly all our public and many of our private schools, and have ceased to find it a subject of wonder, we may be inclined to undervalue its importance. Not so was it regarded in the days of La Salle. Then a Brothers' School was looked upon with admiration. Strangers were shown it as a curiosity worth visiting. It is thus that two merchants of Marseilles are introduced into the Brothers' Schools of Avignon. On their return, so highly did they speak of "the discipline of the schools, the piety of the masters, and the novelty of the method,"[2] that they induced their townsmen to establish similar schools, which in their turn also became the admiration of all who witnessed their working.[3]

This method, as practised by the Brothers to-day, is still the same in principle with that taught by their Blessed Founder. The requirements of the present may have enlarged the course of studies; the accumulated experiences of two centuries may have modified some details and added others; but the broad outlines and the working principle have remained unchanged. Speaking of the teaching man-

[1] *The Popular Education of France*, London, 1861, p. 15.

[2] Ravelet, p. 369. What especially struck the Marseilles merchants was the manner in which a large number of children was taught altogether and at the same time, with very few words on the part of the masters.

[3] Ibid., p. 383.

ual of La Salle, Ravelet says with truth: "If we take a recent copy of this little book, and go back from edition to edition up to the first type, noting in each what has been suppressed or added, we shall be astonished to find how almost alike the latest one is to that emanating from the founder's hands. The rules are the same; the hints and counsels are the same; the expressions, many of them, are the same. In these latter days more stress is laid upon developing the child's intelligence and making less use of mechanical processes. The minds of our children, having in their present environments an earlier development than those of children formerly, admit of this amelioration; but withal the principle of the method has not changed. La Salle had at first glance discovered all that should be done, and there remained but to follow in the path traced out by his genius."[1] Not that La Salle did not make a careful study of the schools and methods within his reach, and take from them whatever he found good and useful. His was too practical a mind to do otherwise. We are told in the earliest edition of the school-manual that has come down to us—that of 1724—how from time to time hints and suggestions were adopted, according as the work progressed and the Brothers were gaining experience, and his own observations multiplied. In 1708 he writes to Brother Gabriel Drolin in Rome, asking for information concerning the rules, management, and government of the Piarist schools there established by St. Joseph Calasanzio.[2] In 1714 we find him stopping over at Lyons for several days, in order to examine the working of Charles Demia's schools.[3]

We take in hand the latest English version of Blessed de La Salle's admirable school-manual. We open it at the fifth chapter, dealing with teaching and method. We there find, within the compass of eight pages, as clear, concise, practical, and efficient a body of rules for teaching with method and

[1] *Histoire du Vénérable J. B. de la Salle*, Ed. 1874, pp. 260, 261.
[2] Ibid., p. 345. [3] Ibid., p. 447.

drawing out the intelligence of the child, as can be found in the whole range of the literature of pedagogy. First, we are told what method is, how it is based upon principles, and therefore not arbitrary; how these principles "are grounded in the subjects to be imparted, and in the intellect to be taught." Then method in teaching is defined "to consist in the selection, arrangement, and employment of means and processes the most fitting to bring the minds of pupils in certain branches of study to a certain degree of development."[1] Already the student of Methodology has opened up to him a field of speculation on which volumes have been written and fruitful volumes still remain to be written. Finally, the practical rules for teaching with method are simply and concisely stated. "The master who teaches with method observes the following rules: 1. He determines the relative intelligence of every child in his class. 2. He adapts his language and explanations to the general capacity of his class, and is careful never to neglect the duller pupils. 3. He makes sure that the pupils know the meaning of the words they employ. 4. He advances from the simple to the complex, from easy to difficult. 5. He makes it a special point to insist greatly on the elementary part of each subject; not to advance till the pupils are well grounded on what goes before. . . . 9. To state but few principles at a time, but to explain them well. . . . 10. To speak much to the eyes of the pupils, making use of the blackboard. . . . 11. To prepare every lesson carefully. 12. To place no faulty models or standards before the pupils; always to speak to them in a sensible manner, expressing one's self in good English, and with clearness and precision. 13. To employ none but exact definitions and well-founded divisions. . . . 18. To assert nothing without being positively certain of its truth, especially as regards facts, definitions, or principles. 19. To make frequent use of the system of question and answer."[2]

[1] Management of Christian Schools, New York, 1887, p. 31.

[2] Management of Christian Schools, chap. v., art. ii., pp. 31-33.

Then come twenty rules laid down concerning the mode of putting questions and receiving answers: "Every question should be clear, brief, special, and adapted to the capacity of the pupils.... Questions should generally begin according to a certain order, so as to retain the connection of all the parts, and lead up to the proper development of the lesson; in recapitulations, however, this rule might be profitably departed from.... The pupils should be taught not to answer too hastily, but to reflect first on the question put to them... When the master gives an answer it should possess the following qualities: it should be brief; it should be clear and exact; it should be adapted to the capacity of the average, and even of the most deficient pupil; it should express a complete meaning, independently of the question."[1] The rules that we have omitted from these extracts are no less to the point. They all bespeak the same practical good sense. They reveal an intimate knowledge of boy-nature. Written to cover the requirements of men engaged in elementary teaching, the rules of this school-manual stand for all time, and are equally applicable to the teaching of higher studies. They are the same rules by which Blessed de la Salle prepared the sons of the noblemen who followed James II. to France for positions of trust in the land of their exile. They are the principles by which, under his supervision, his disciples made the boarding-school of St. Yon the most successful and advanced polytechnic school of its day. They are the principles with which he indoctrinated the young teachers he sent forth from the normal schools which he had established. They prevail to-day in the workshops of St. Nicholas at Paris, and in those of the Catholic Protectory of New York; in the chemical laboratory of the Brothers' house at Passy, and in the science room of their college at Tooting; in their language courses at Cairo, and in their literary and philosophic courses at Manhattan. They prevail, above all, in the innumerable parish schools that the

[1] Management of Christian Schools, chap. v., art. iv., pp. 35-38.

Brothers conduct the word over. They prevail in all the class-rooms of all the lay religious teaching orders of men and women, who have now more or less modelled their methods upon that of Blessed de la Salle.

The Church, in crowning him Blessed, has most fittingly given to popular education a patron. He is the benefactor of the modern schoolmaster. He it was who raised primary teaching out of the ruts of never-ending routine, carried on in the midst of time-honored noise and confusion, and, in giving it principles and a method, made of it a science. He hedged in the dignity of the schoolmaster. He was the first to assert the exclusive right of the master to devote his whole time to his school-work. Prior to him, teachers, if clerics, were ecclesiastics with a varying round of parish-duties to perform likewise, or were students making their own studies for the priesthood; if laymen, they sang at the public offices of the church, rang the bells, and performed the functions of sacristan. Not that such functions were at all considered as degrading. On the contrary, in those ages of faith it was thought an honor to serve in the house of God in any the most menial capacity.[1] Here was the usual formula of agreement to which the teacher subscribed: "The aforesaid Gaillardet promises to teach reading, writing, ciphering, and plain-chant. . . . .He also obligates himself to ring the priory bells when storms, tempests, or hail-showers threaten, and to sing in the said priory during Advent and Lent."[2] These terms sound strange to modern ears; but they bring us nearer to, and throw light upon, other times and other customs. The outside services were distracting. They left little or no time for preparation of lessons. Blessed de la Salle, through much opposition and no small persecution on account thereof, withdrew the Brothers from all such distractions. He brought home to

[1] Alain, *L'Instruction Primaire avant la Révolution*, p. 132.

[2] L. Maggiolo, Art. *Bourgogne*, in Buisson's *Dictionnaire de Pédagogie.*

them that their calling was one worthy of their whole energy and their undivided attention. "The new institute set out with this thought, that teaching is less a career or instrument of fortune, than that it is the most elevated expression of the spirit of sacrifice and devotedness." [1] Nor is this all. La Salle broke down the barriers of exclusiveness that confined the schoolmaster to certain subjects, beyond which he dare not go, to the detriment of poor children. Thus, a decree of 1661 forbade the teachers of elementary schools to instruct their pupils in writing beyond the merest elements, without a writingmaster's license; while on the other hand writingmasters were also restricted in their subjects. [2] By ignoring these distinctions, introducing the modern, simple, and more efficient method of writing, and enlarging the whole course of popular instruction, Blessed de la Salle drew upon himself and his disciples the enmity of the writingmasters, and emancipated the youth of France from their thraldom. Still more: in making, for the first time in the history of education, the mother-tongue the basis of all instruction, he appealed to the intelligence of the child, prepared the way for the study of national literature, and opened up to the grown man avenues of knowledge and amusement that had hitherto been encumbered with rubbish. His was the merit of the pioneer. And if to-day the artisan and the workingman, the world over, can read and write and discuss intelligently all the political and social issues of the hour, they owe it in great measure to the method of teaching completed and perfected by Blessed de la Salle and his disciples, the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

BROTHER AZARIAS.

[1] De Charmasse, *L'Instruction Primaire dans l'Ancien Diocèse d'Autun*, p. 41.
[2] Ch. Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris*, p. 215.

THE INDULGENCES OF THE BRIDGETINE ROSARY IN THEIR RELATION TO THOSE OF THE DOMINICAN, OR COMMON ROSARY.

According to the AM. ECCL. REV. for 1890, note, page 54, it is clear that by virtue of faculty 9, formulary C, our bishops, and priests delegated by them, can give to the ordinary rosary, by simply making over it the sign of the cross, together with the papal also the so-called Bridgetine indulgence.

But who practically gains these Bridgetine indulgences? I answer with full conviction: they are gained, if at all, by very few among us. Why? The reason is, that very few know how the Bridgetine rosary is to be said in order to gain the indulgences. If the works prescribed as necessary for the gaining of an indulgence are not performed in the manner specified, the indulgence is not obtained, no matter how firmly one may believe that he has fulfilled the prescribed conditions. In our case there is indeed an excuse for the error. In several works lately published by writers of good standing, it is said that these indulgences may be gained by saying the common rosary. But the same authors tell us that in the time of Benedict XIII. the indulgences of the ordinary rosary and those of the Bridgetine rosary were perfectly identical, but that Benedict XIV. (document not given), imparted special indulgences to the Bridgetine rosary, and finally, that when saying this rosary it is not necessary to meditate upon the mystery as is required in the ordinary rosary of St. Dominic; and that such meditation is not necessary even when the Bridgetine rosary is said after the manner of the common rosary. Will not every person who reads these words say to himself: if that be the case, then I wish to gain the Bridgetine indulgences. Many, we feel convinced, up to the present day have thought and have acted thus.

Let us, however, examine the matter a little more closely, and for this purpose let us consult the perfectly reliable edition of the Raccolta di Orazioni e pie Opere of 1886, approved by Leo XIII., May 24th, 1886, as the standard for all, and P. Behringer's approved work,[1] who has drawn carefully from all sources.

1. It is true that in saying the Bridgetine rosary the meditation on the mysteries is not necessary. The Congregation of Indulgences has so decided on several occasions.[2]

2. It is true only in a certain sense that the indulgences of the Bridgetine rosary are greater than those of the common rosary. But there are two ways[3] of saying the Bridgetine rosary, and different indulgences are obtained according to the method chosen. If one chooses the *shorter* method, of five decades, each decade consisting of one "Our Father," and ten "Hail Marys," and the Creed, then only two plenary indulgences are obtained, one on any day of the year, provided one has said this rosary every day, and the other on the feast of St. Bridget (8th Oct.), if one has recited it at least every week. In both instances confession, Communion, and the prayers to be said according to the intention of the Holy Father are necessary, and to gain the indulgence, one must also visit his parish church.[4]

Compared with these indulgences those of the ordinary rosary are much greater. For, besides a plenary indulgence that may be gained on any day of the year (confession, Communion, and the prayers according to the intention of the Holy Father being necessary), for saying at least the third part of the rosary, or five decades, daily, and another plenary indulgence (under the same conditions as above) if one recites the rosary in the confraternity of the Living Rosary at a fixed hour,[5] and a third plenary indulgence on the last Sunday of every month (confession, Com-

[1] Die Ablässe, Paderborn und Münster, 1887.
[2] Behringer, p. 361.
[3] Ibid., p. 359; Raccolta, pp. 191, 192.
[4] Behringer, p. 359; Raccolta, pp. 191, 192.
[5] Behringer, pp. 702, 803.

munion, and prayers according to the intention af the Holy Father, said in a church, being necessary), for reciting the rosary in common with others at least three times each week, — one gains for each Our "Father," and each "Hail Mary" 100 days indulgence, and if said in common, in addition thereto ten years and ten times 40 days, once a day. Finally, to gain the indulgences of the common rosary, it suffices when it is recited in common that one person makes use of the rosary, and that the others in this case unite themselves with him, a privilege which cannot, however, be said to belong to the Bridgetine rosary. [1]

3. If, however, one recites the original, or *longer* Bridgetine rosary, *it would appear* that more indulgences are obtained than by saying the ordinary, or Dominican rosary; for, prescinding from certain partial indulgences which may be gained by the performance of certain good works, if a person devoutly carries the rosary about him, he can gain, as often as he says it, an indulgence of seven years and seven times 40 days, and for each "Our Father," and each "Hail Mary" and Creed 100 days; if it be recited every day for a whole month, a plenary indulgence may be gained on any day after previous confession, Communion, and the recitation of the indulgence-prayers; finally, a person can obtain the plenary indulgence for the hour of death under the usual conditions, provided one has recited the rosary at least once a week. [2]

But in this case he who wishes to gain the indulgences must say six decades, each decade consisting of one "Our Father," ten "Hail Marys," and the Creed, and in addition one "Our Father" and three "Hail Marys," thus making in all 63 "Hail Marys," in honor of the 63 years spent by Our Lady here on earth, and 7 "Our Fathers," to commemorate her seven joys and seven sorrows.

From the foregoing we learn the relation of the Bridget-

[1] Behringer, pp. 574--376, 36', 368; Raccolta, p. 204.
[2] Behringer, pp. 358, 359; Raccolta, pp. 190, 191.

ine to the ordinary rosary, and we see how the former is to be recited.

4. As we have remarked elsewhere, certain recent authors maintain that, when by virtue of an apostolic faculty the Bridgetine indulgences have been imparted to the rosary of five or of fifteen decades, a person, by using this "Bridgetized" rosary to recite the ordinary one, can gain the Bridgetine indulgences. Now the decrees quoted to sustain this opinion, dated Oct. 2, 1840, and Jan. 28, 1842, both published for Rouen, and taken from Prinzivalli's Collection,[1] together with the decrees of Aug. 12, 1726, Dec. 25, 1841, and Jan. 24, 1842, cited in decree of Jan. 28, 1842, for Rouen, have all been omitted in the collection approved as authentic by Leo XIII., Aug. 19, 1882. Hence they cannot be adduced as proof. The decree of Jan. 15, 1839,[2] also cited in proof, does not, in the first place, say what it is quoted as saying, and in the second place it is itself based upon an old edition of the Raccolta, in which the indulgences of the Bridgetine rosary and the manner of praying it are not stated so clearly and so precisely as to dispel all doubts; but this defect has been remedied in the last edition of the Raccolta.[3] Father Behringer, who is now consultor of the Congregation of Indulgences, and for that reason well versed in these matters, tells us that the obtaining of the Bridgetine indulgences attached to the two ways of saying the rosary does not depend upon the fact that the *material* rosary has five or six or ten or fifteen decades, but upon the fact that such rosary has been blessed by a priest having the faculty, and that the form of prayer as given above be observed. Therefore, he adds, one can say the longer Bridgetine rosary on one of five decades.[4] Hence, to gain the Bridgetine indulgences of the rosary, it must be recited in the manner given in the Raccolta, which we have described above; nor will it suffice to pray the ordinary rosary.

[1] A private collection; cfr. Linzer Quartal-Schr., 1889, p. 379.
[2] Decr. authentica, n. 268. [3] Behringer, p. 360. [4] Behringer, pp. 362–364.

5. But, as the ordinary or Dominican rosary is the only one that can be said to be in general use among us, and as on the other hand the proper manner of saying the rosary in order to gain the Bridgetine indulgences is not sufficiently known, it is clear from what has been said that the Bridgetine rosary indulgences are gained, if at all, by very few persons. For this reason, and also because Leo XIII, in his repeated recommendations of the rosary, which according to the general opinion refer to the common rosary, spoke exclusively of the latter, the faculty to impart the Bridgetine indulgences is of little or of no importance to us.

Here—and the same may be said of most other countries—only the faculty for the ordinary rosary is of practical importance.

Now, who has this faculty among us? It is evident from the Raccolta, page 205, and from Behringer, page 375, that the Dominicans have it, for it is the general custom on missions that the different missionaries bless these rosaries, and consequently they must have this faculty from the general of the Dominicans; that the Redemptorist Fathers enjoy it appears from the *Trésor Spirituel*,[1] p. 257, by P. Ulrich, a consultor-general of the same Congregation, and from the *Petit Trésor Spirituel*,[2] p. 70, of P. Jacques.

But have our bishops, by virtue of faculty 9, formulary C, and the priests to whom they communicate such faculty, the power to bless the Dominican rosary?

It cannot be doubted that the directors of the confraternities of the rosary, erected by our bishops in good faith up to July 16, 1887, and under that date rendered valid *in radice* by the Holy Father, have this power, but it can be exercised only for the members of such confraternities, and for no others; such members can gain greater and more numerous indulgences by saying the rosary than those who are not members.

This and nothing more is what P. Konings seems also to

[1] Paris and Tournai, Castennan, 1863. [2] Paris and Tournai, 1883.

maintain in speaking of the subject.[1] The same thing is expressed in a decree of June 7, 1842,[2] where we are told that, if the pastor is the only priest in the place where the confraternity exists, he is to be considered its director, with the power to bless rosaries for the members, etc.

The faculty, however, to bless the Dominican rosary for non-members of confraternities of the rosary differs entirely from the other faculty of which we have spoken. Nowhere is it stated that the directors of the confraternities of the rosary can bless rosaries for non-members.

With regard to the faculty of our bishops contained in fac. 9, form. C., so far as the blessing of the rosaries is concerned, they can now, according to a brief of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, dated June, 1889,[3] give only the ordinary confraternity indulgences, and there is no mention of further privileges.

There is therefore only one course open to him who wishes to impart to the rosaries of the faithful who are not members of a Confraternity the ordinary rosary indulgences outside the time of missions: that is to say, he has to send in a petition for this faculty (possibly through some Dominican superior) to the general of the order. If the faculty be obtained, he must observe the restriction generally added—which holds good also for missionaries, dummodo nullus sacerdos ex ordine Prædicatorum inveniatur;" then he can bless rosaries of five, ten, or fifteen decades, but not those of six decades; finally, in blessing them he must make use of the prescribed formula, that is, he cannot use the formula to be found in the excerpta ex Rituali Romano, with the title, Benedictio Coronarum aut Rosariorum, printed at Baltimore, but the one which in the Rit. Rom., Edit. Ratisbon., 1882, p. 112, and in Behringer, p. 860, is marked as propria ordinis Prædicatorum.[4] He can then also impart to the rosaries thus blessed the papal and the Bridgetine indulgences, pro-

[1] Comment in facult., n. 142.
[2] Decret. auth., n. 304.
[3] Vide Am. Eccl. Rev., 1889, p. 465.
[4] Behringer, pp. 326, 375, 860.

vided he has obtained from his bishop *for the members of the diocese* the necessary power ex facultate 9, formulæ C. It is clear from the concluding words of formula C, "nec illis ubi possit extra fines suæ diœcesis," that such blessing can be validly given only for members of the diocese.[1] The faculty to bless rosaries obtained from the general of the Dominicans is the only one which may be used for all persons without distinction. J. P.

THE CÆSAREAN OPERATION—POST MORTEM MATRIS.

Sacra Embryologia sive de Officio sacerdotum, medicorum et aliorum circa æternam parvulorum in utero existentium salutem libri quattuor: auctore et interprete Francisco Emmanuele Cangiamila, S. Theol. et U. J. Doctore, in Compendium redacti. Ipris, 1775.—*Ejusdem operis Epitome Parisiis anno* 1766 *evulgati idiomate Gallico a D. Dinouart.*

Traité Pratique d' Embriologie Sacrée ou Théologique. Par P. J. C. Debreyne, Docteur en médecine, de la faculté de Paris, professeur particulier de médecine pratique, prêtre et religieux de la Grande-Trappe (Orne). Ed. 1845 *and* 1853.

La Théologie Morale et les sciences médicales. Par Le P. Debreyne. Sixième édition entièrement refondue par Le Dr. A. Ferrand, médecin des hôpitaux de Paris, chevalier de S. Grégoire Le Grand.—Paris, 1884.

Medicina Pastoralis. Edidit Dr. C. Capellmann, medicus Aquisgranensis. Editio Septima, Latinarum altera.—Aquisgrani, Sumpt. Rudolphi Barth. 1890.

American Journal of Obstetrics. Vol. XII. Paper by Dr. E. J. Duer.

Vita S. Raymundi. Act. Sanct. Aug.—Vol. VI.

It not unfrequently happens, particularly in large cities, that a priest is called to administer the last sacraments to a mother "quæ versatur in statu prægnationis" and is certain to die before the birth of her child. As it is possible for the latter not only to live "in utero" for some time after the

[1] Konings, Comment. in facult, n. 118; Litelli, Appar. Jur. Eccl., p. 58.

mother's death, but there is also, if the circumstances are otherwise favorable, every hope of prolonged life for the infant, the civil law in Europe ordains in the interest of humanity, and hence under penalty, that physicians in such cases perform what is called the Cæsarean operation. By this means the child's life is often saved after the death of its mother.

Apart from the principle of humanity which underlies the civil legislation in this case, we are to be guided by the religious principle, which seeks to secure the eternal salvation of the child, through the administration of Baptism, whenever it is possible to do so. According to Catholic theology there are several ways in which the sacramental grace of Baptism may be supplied through the providence of God to those who are outside of the reach of human assistance; but on the other hand, man's neglect or fault may cause a soul which has been intrusted to his care to perish. Hence the Roman Ritual, laying down certain fundamental rules to be observed in the administration of the sacrament of Baptism to children, says on this point: "*Si mater prægnans mortua fuerit, fœtus quam primum caute extrahatur, ac si vivus fuerit, baptizatur.*"[1] It will be noticed that the Ritual makes no distinction as regards the probabilities of the fœtus being alive, nor does it mention anything as to its age or the person who is to perform the operation. It merely instructs the priest what is to be done "si mater prægnans mortua fuerit."

The rule is plain enough in what it states, viz., quam primum—caute—ac si vivus fuerit, baptizatur. Nevertheless, in its practical application it gives rise to a number of perplexing doubts in the mind of a priest when he is unexpectedly made aware of his responsibility in the matter.[2] Is he

[1] "Rituale Rom., Tit. II., Cap. i, de Baptizandis Parvulis, n. 17.

[2] A priest in one of our large cities, who has had a number of such cases within the last few years, writes to us: From the questionable success of the operation, and the immense effort expended, getting doctors to remain or come at the exact time,

bound at all hazards to have this operation performed? And what becomes of this obligation of preserving the life of the child, if there be no one competent or willing to save it by the means suggested; or, if the members of the family should protest, although the priest advise it and the surgeon be prepared to perform it; or if, on the other hand, the physician himself object, because he deems it useless, either believing the child to be already dead or that it could not outlive the operation? Or supposing that priest or physician miss the hour of death, what time must have elapsed before the obligation to take action in the hope of saving a life and a soul could cease for him? These and similar doubts that may arise are questions to which we find but scant answer in theological books, yet which confront us in one form or other in the practical ministry. In attempting to point out a safe line of conduct we cannot merely appeal to the principles laid down in the science of theology. We must look on the one hand to certain positive rules of ecclesiastical discipline regarding the subject, and on the other to such views of experienced physicians as have been accepted by the professional world and which offer a sound basis for the carrying out of Catholic principle. All theologians agree that there exists without doubt an obligation to have the Cæsarean section performed immediately after the death of the mother in statu prægnationis.[1] But what is practically the

the anxiety, etc.—in one case I remained up all night awaiting the mother's death—I am led to write you and seek how far the obligation extends in practice, if you will allow the modification. I know the theologians say there is an obligation, etc., but can it be practically carried out?

[1] Igitur mortua matre, nullum dubium est, quin sectio fieri possit et debeat, idque etiamsi conceptio a brevi tempore facta sit. Quare quam citissime fieri potest, chirurgus aliusve, qui possit sectionem facere, advocandus est: interim vero uterus matris mortuæ calidus servandus, os ejus aperiendum est, *neque facile credendum est medico* forte dicenti, omnem conatum incassum fieri, eo quod fœtus jam sit emortuus: siquidem id raro omnino certo sciunt.—Lehmkuhl, Theol. Moral., vol. II., L. I., Tr. II., n. 75, 3.

EXTENT OF THIS OBLIGATION

on the part of a priest? We answer the question at once by reference to an instruction of the S. Congregation of the Inquisition, whose office is to lay down practical rules of conduct in disciplinary matters touching faith and morals. The Sacred Office urges the obligation of saving the life of the child and deprecates the false and unreasonable notions of modesty which would prevent us from advising and urging it. The document then proceeds: "Hæc autem fœtus extractio de prægnantis defunctæque alvo matris *quamvis patefacienda* ut dicimus *ac persuadenda sit, expresse tamen cavet prohibetque* Sanctitas sua, *ne Missionarii* in casibus particularibus *se ingerant in demandanda* sectione, multoque minus in ea peragenda. *Sat proinde Missionariis fuerit illius notitiam edidisse, curasseque ut ejus perficiendæ rationem addiscant, qui chirurgicis intendunt, laici homines,* tum vero cum casus tulerit, ejusdem praxim ipsorum oneri ac muneri reliquisse."[1] The priest's duty therefore is to call the serious attention of the physician, or of those who are likely to see that the injunction be carried out, to the fact that the fœtus may and should receive baptism. But he is neither called upon to perform the operation himself nor to persist in forcing others to do it. This is the extent of his obligation. We cannot, however, wholly ignore the fact that there may be cases of real necessity, wherein a priest would be justified in performing without prejudice to his calling or other risk an operation which as a rule is forbidden him as unseemly to his state and requiring a particular skill which belongs ordinarily only to the practised surgeon. Under such circumstances the question of saving a soul, the reserved wording of the Ritual, the indefinite manner in which theologians generally speak of this obligation, and perhaps even the fact that the Rescript of the S. Congregation addresses itself expressly to missionary priests only, would decide the doubt in favor of the

[1] S. C. S. O., 15 Febr. 1760. Cf. Bucceroni, Enchiridion Morale, n. 256.

child. Cangiamila and Debreyne make no doubt whatever of the matter, but both seem to us to urge this point all too strenuously.

In the case of a physician who is himself a practical Catholic we can hardly suppose that he could object to performing the section for the purpose of conferring Baptism upon the fœtus, no matter at what stage of its life. As the existence of the soul is commonly admitted by theologians to be coincident with the first development of vitality, only certain death of the fœtus could justify the omission of at least conditional Baptism. Lehmkuhl adds on this point: Neque post longius etiam tempus, si statim collatus non sit, baptismus omittendus est.[1] And what is said here in regard to conscientious Catholic physicians may be said of the medical profession in this country generally. Every respectable physician would defer to the expressed wish of a priest to perform the operation in order that Baptism might be administered, even if there were no doubt that the fœtus could not outlive the exposure. We are informed that this is a rule of professional conduct taught in our medical schools. It may happen that a physician, although willing and perfectly competent to operate, would yet be either ignorant of, or fail to appreciate the requisites to a valid administration of the sacrament, and expose the fœtus in such a way as to frustrate Baptism. For this reason the physician of the soul must be prepared to give intelligent direction if it be needed. The necessary caution under this head may be learned from such works on pastoral medicine as have been placed at the head of this paper.[2] It must suffice here to cite a passage from Capellmann, which is approvingly quoted by Lehmkuhl. Speaking of the "fœtus qui ovo inclusus editur," he says: "approbare non possum, ut in *ovo clauso* baptismus conferatur.... Si caute ovum aperitur, atque si liquor amnii lente, hoc est, nisi ex negligentia subito profluat, aër accedens

[1] Theol. Moral., Vol. II., loc. cit.

[2] Ferrand's work is less satisfactory in this respect than his model Debreyne.

fœtum quamvis exiguum non illico occidet. Tum.... aperto ovo e vestigio baptismus sub conditione conferatur.... *Utilissimum ac certissimum* consilium erit, ut baptismum *per immersionem* conferant, et ita quidem, ut *in* vel *sub* aqua (non frigida, sed nonnihil tepida) velamenta disrumpant, hisque disruptis *statim formulam baptismi pronuntient.* Apprehende igitur utriusque manus pollice et indice aliquam velamenti plicaturam, atque ita disrumpe, ut *materia ovi effluat*, h. e., ut aqua baptismalis integram ovi materiam bene abluat. Quod si ita fit, etiam vitabitur accedentis aëris appulsus in embryonem, quem nonnulli adeo timent." [1] Lehmkuhl adds to the note the following observation: "At ut securius agas, fœtum *et* immerge in aquam *et* ex ea extrahe."

Occasionally a physician is met with who will object to the operation on the ground that in most cases the fœtus of less than 28 weeks dies with, if not before the mother, and that this is invariably the case in certain diseases. Again, that, as the signs of death are frequently deceptive, there is danger of operating on a living body instead of a corpse, until after some hours, when, the forerunners of decomposition having set in, all doubt is removed. Of course, we must respect the judgment of the physician, as this matter belongs to his profession. Nevertheless, it is well to understand the real force of these objections, which at the hands of unscrupulous practitioners might serve to shield a mere reluctance to perform an act of humanity or charity. This is all the more necessary when we remember that in many cases, especially of the poor, the priest is the only person who can intelligently urge the saving of the child, although it would perhaps be preferable if such request came from some responsible member of the family.

As to the likelihood of the fœtus dying before or with the mother, all authorities on the subject agree that no fixed rule can be laid down. Statistics taken from a French maternity Hospital show that fully thirty per cent of children delivered

[1] Medicina pastor., ed. lat. altera, pp. 111, 112.

before the twenty-eighth week continued to live, and Dr. Wm. H. Parish, professor of Anatomy, Women's Medic. Coll., and president of the Obstetrical Soc. at Philadelphia, expresses his opinion that the European law might more justly be fixed at 23 instead of 28 weeks. Capellmann makes the same suggestion in his work. Considering the recent improvements in the way of fostering the young life by incubation and artificial nutrition, the time of viability may be placed even earlier than this. In all these cases—and whenever "extractio per vias naturales" is impossible—medical authorities consider the Cæsarian section to be an imperative duty on the part of the physician. "One must not wait for the consent of a relative. It is sufficient to have no active resistance from that direction. The surviving parent should not be permitted to doom the imprisoned fœtus to death."[1]

In regard to the probable vitality of the fœtus previous to the time above indicated it appears quite impossible to lay down any fixed rule. The signs usually looked upon as indicative of death are with one or two exceptions deceptive. Dr. Parish assures us that "the fœtal heart sounds may be absent, and yet the fœtus be living."[2] And the rule which he lays down for physicians with respect to the time when viability of the fœtus is probable, holds good for us in all cases where it is possible to administer Baptism validly. No matter how probable it is that the fœtus will die or is already dead, the physician is bound by the law of his profession to perform the section *unless he is certain* of the death of the fœtus. "Where it is very probable that the fœtus will die or that it is already dead, nondelivery is unjustifiable. Only certain death of the fœtus can justify the attendant from withholding his hand."[3] As it is very difficult to have evidence of the death of the fœtus, "it ought to have the benefit of the doubt for Baptism."

[1] Two cases of Cæsarean section—post mortem matris, by Dr. Wm. H. Parish. "Weekly Medical Review," Jan. 18, 1890, page 42.

[2] Loc. cit. [3] Ibid.

It is quite evident from the principles laid down in the best medical text books which are in use in this country, that every physician who respects the code of ethics of his profession, no matter what his religious convictions are, will readily undertake the operation for the purpose of baptism. "Delivery *prior to viability, by section or otherwise, is indicated for purpose of baptism, if the relatives or deceased mother's clergyman so desire, for we as physicians must respect such religious rights and convictions.*[1]

The second objection is one more serious. Catalepsy assumes at times a likeness of death so perfect that only the most skilled physician can detect a difference. Facts in the history of the medical profession prove that practitioners using the scalpel on what they thought to be a corpse found it assuming life under their hands and failed in the operation owing to the sudden excitement. Capellmann deals with this objection in the following manner: It is evident that the operation should be performed as quickly as possible after the death of the mother. Considerable difficulties may arise from the fact that it is not always easy to acquire absolute certainty of death, especially when the decease was sudden. But the physician may in this case prove his skill and presence of mind. Let him perform the operation with the same caution as if he were performing it on a living body, so that nothing be lost if the woman who seemed dead be still living.[2] Dr. Theophilus Parvin, in his well-known work *Science and Art of Obstetrics*,[3] makes use of almost the same words in this connection, but mentions the method of Thévenot "per vias naturales" as preferable in cases of doubt as to the actual death of the mother. Every physician knows that there is nothing exceptionally dangerous in the operation itself, if properly performed, and the firm hand of the surgeon, guided by a cool head, can accomplish it in a few minutes.

[1] Dr. Parish, loc. cit.
[2] Medicina Pastoralis, pag. 28.
[3] Philad., 1886, p. 671.

It has been asked: what is the limit of time that may elapse between the death of the mother and the operation before it would be certain that the fœtus had perished. The question is evidently important, since probably in the majority of such cases it will happen that either the priest or the physician or both are absent at the moment of death. Prof. Duer's table shows that in several instances a living fœtus was removed two hours after the death of the mother. Dr. Parish, supplementing Duer's statistics, authenticates a case in which a fœtus in the twenty-eighth week was taken from a corpse two and a half hours after the death of the mother. She had been suffering from protracted *phthisis pulmonalis*, a disease in which it is generally believed that the fœtus dies either before or immediately after the mother. Of another case the same authority says: "We estimate it was about twenty-five minutes after the mother's death before permission to make a section was granted. As I still held my knife in my hand I made a rapid section, and in two strokes the fœtus was removed."[1]

In the absence of the physician direction should be given to keep the corpse, circa regionem uteri, wrapt in warm flannel, etc. In this way a soul and a valuable life may frequently be saved, of which fact we have a striking instance in the life of St.. Raymond, who has his surname *Nonnatus* from the fact that he was brought to life by the Cæsarean operation after the death of his mother.[2]

It is remarkable that in his case the physicians assured the father that the child, not 28 weeks old, was unquestionably dead and had in fact caused the mother's death. The count, being not only a devout Catholic but a well-informed man, had serious doubts, and a relative who stood by, seeing

[1] Vd. article cited above.

[2] Ideo Nonnatus dictus, quod cæso defunctæ matris utero prodiit. Acta Sanct., Aug., Tom. VI., pag. 737. An old antiphon in honor of the Saint reads:

"Levamen miseris S. Ramon impetra:
Te Deus vivum traxit ab utero matris extinctæ."

that precious time was being lost in argument, took a poignard and made a bold incision in the left side, when the child was laid open, showing signs of life.[1] Thus the learned cardinal, the saintly priest, the man who spent his goods and life to redeem thousands of captives in the Algerian slave markets that they might obtain the grace of baptism and the hope of heaven, was preserved to the world and to the Church. How easily he might have perished!

In conclusion, we would add the wise and practical remarks of a physician who speaks from long experience, and who has studied this subject in particular in its connection with Catholic Theology. "Primis quidem mensibus prægnationis *vix unquam sperandum est*, fore ut ovulum sectione cæsarea *vivens extrahatur*. *Completo autem quarto fere mense* sectionem cæsaream facerem, dummodo ne graves habeantur rationes existimandi, fœtum jam ante matrem vel simul cum matre mortuum esse; imprimis sectionem cæsaream facerem, quandocumque mulieres prægnantes subitanea vel celerrima morte præripiuntur."[2] We have italicized the words which indicate on what ground a practical judgment may be formed. For the rest, charity must be held by the hand of prudence and knowledge.

THE SPECIAL FACULTIES GRANTED TO PRIESTS IN FAVOR OF THE "PROP. OF THE FAITH."

A LARGE number of our American dioceses have in the past and are still being aided by the alms collected through the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith," whose headquarters are in France. The contributions which the society receives from those parts of Catholic America which in former days it helped to build up are in no proportion to the sums annually distributed to our needy churches West and

[1] Saint Raymond Nonnat, *Les Petits Bollandistes*. Tom. X., p. 357.

[2] Capellm., Medic. Past., p. 27.

South in the United States.[1] This looks like a long shadow for our time of day, when we remember that the unparalleled success, the prosperity, generosity, and zeal of Catholic America are being sounded abroad as having attained their noonday-light of glory. "Our poor relations" are actually beggars at the hand of European Catholics. This apathy is not without ingratitude, as even those dioceses which to-day enjoy great prosperity were in their early struggles sustained by the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith." It sounds, therefore, like a gentle rebuke when we read in last year's Report of the Society the following words referring to America: "That Church, founded by the alms and prayers of our first associates, continues in peace the course of its glorious destinies."[2] In fact, considerably less is done now than in former times. Then the "Annals" were regularly published in this country; to-day we have to ask the loan of them from Ireland, where 12,500 copies are printed for English readers. France issues over 200,000 copies for her own country, including the Breton Edition; Germany prints 31,400 and Italy 21,500 copies; besides, there are Spanish, Flemish, Portuguese, Dutch, Basque, and Polish editions. Of course, there are some excuses for this retrogression on our part; still, they weigh little against what may justly be expected of us.

Whilst our own needs and hence the demands made upon the society from America are daily lessening, those of other lands increase. The missionary field in Asia, Africa, and Oceanica is constantly growing, and the necessities in some of these abandoned regions are extremely urgent. With little encouragement from the respective governments which control the countries south and east of Europe, and much

[1] The accounts of the Society for the year 1888 show that America received for poor missions in various parts of the country, including the entire continent, 533,613 francs, whereas she contributed only 331,211; in other words, we received the gratuitous donation of over 40,000 dollars for our poor churches.

[2] Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, January, 1890, page 7.

opposition from factions and traders who allure the natives simply to make them instruments of their avarice and cruelty, the missionaries have to contend with a thousand obstacles from without. To make any headway in civilizing the barbarians, they must employ, as far as possible, the superior methods of modern civilization. They require both apparatus and money. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith collects annually over a million dollars from those who are in the peaceful and prosperous enjoyment of their faith. This money is judiciously distributed wherever needed to help the struggling churches throughout the world. It goes without saying that the demands are greater than the supply of this devoted association can go. Hence Leo XIII, in repeated Encyclical Letters,[1] not only urgently recommended the work to the zeal and generosity of the faithful, but has enriched it with unusual privileges. The latest of these favors are in behalf of priests.

According to a Pontifical Rescript, dated August, 1889, and granted in answer to a request made by the heads of the Association in France, the following special Faculties are granted:

I. *To priests who, having been duly authorized for the purpose, collect alms for the work of the "Propagation of the Faith" in a parish or institution* (irrespective of the sum they may receive); *or who from their own resources shall contribute yearly the amount of about fifty Dollars:* [2]

1st. The favor of the Privileged Altar three times a week.[3]

2d. The faculty of applying a Plenary Indulgence to the faithful at the hour of death; of applying the Apostolic Indulgences to the blessing of rosaries, crosses, crucifixes, pictures, statuettes and medals; to impart the Bridgetine Indulgences.

[1] Dec. 3, 1880; July 25, 1883.

[2] The equivalent of one hundred subscriptions, or, 10 £. 16 sh. 8 d. English money.

[3] This would be independent of any similar privilege already enjoyed by those who have the personal faculty of the "altare privilegiatum."

3d. The faculty of attaching to *crucifixes* the Indulgence of the *Via crucis.*

II. Priests who are members of a council or committee appointed to watch over the interests of the Association, etc.; or who make a return within the year of a sum of five hundred Dollars collected for the Association, are entitled to the following privileges:

1st. The same faculties as in the preceding category.

2d. The favor of the Privileged Altar five times a week, personally.

3d. The faculty of blessing *crosses* by attaching to them the Indulgences applied to the exercise of the *Via crucis.*

The faculty of investing with the seraphic cord and scapular, and all the Indulgences and privileges granted to this investiture by the Sovereign Pontiffs.

4th. The faculty of blessing and investing the faithful with the scapulars of *Mount Carmel*, the *Immaculate Conception*, and the *Passion of Our Lord.*

III. A priest who contributes at one time from his private resources five hundred Dollars[1] *obtains for life the faculties granted to priests who are members of a council, as already mentioned.*[2]

There are probably few priests who, rightly understanding the value of these privileges, would not gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of obtaining them and thus promote at the same time the noble work of evangelizing the nations. Although we enjoy already some of the above-mentioned faculties, the greater part of them are the exclusive right of the religious Orders, to whom the secular clergy have to refer the faithful of their own flocks who seek the special graces connected with the respective devotions. Isolated privileges of this kind may be obtained by direct application to Rome; but they are generally restricted. The privileged altar, the granting of the cord of St. Francis, the Indulgences

[1] A sum representing the total of a thousand subscriptions.

[2] The original Letter and Rescript will be found below in this number, under *Analecta.*

of the *Via crucis* attached to crucifixes, etc., are favors of sufficient importance to every parish priest to invite the effort of an annual collection for the work of the "Propagation," or, where the personal resources of a priest allow it, the sacrifice of a sum of money which is better thus invested during life than left in charity after death.

A CASE OF ELECTION BRIBE.

X., a candidate at an election, during his canvass offers B., one of his constituents, ten Dollars, not a word being exchanged between them as to the object for which the money is paid; but B. feels perfectly satisfied that the object is to influence his vote. B. accepts the money, intending at the same time not to be influenced by the bribe, and as a matter of fact votes according to his conscience.

Qu. Is B. guilty of sin in accepting the money?

Resp. Let us assume that B. in accepting the money is guilty of sin. The sin would arise out of a violation either of justice, or of charity, or of both. It would be a violation of justice, if B., in accepting the money, consented to a contract, at the same time having the intention of not performing his part of the agreement. But this can hardly be said to be the case here; for, although words are not essential to the validity of a contract, there must be at least a mutual understanding leaving no doubt on either side as to the intention of binding themselves by the terms implied in the agreement. There is here indeed on the one side the assumed intention "do ut des," but no more. It is simply what theologians call a "donum ad alliciendum." X. could not determine what value B. might set upon his right of vote, even under the supposition that the latter were willing to sell it. It would require a more definite declaration on B's. part than the acceptance of a gift without other reference to the supposed venal commodity.

De Lugo, speaking of those who accept gifts offered them with a view of obtaining certain offices and emoluments in return, says: "Etiamsi aliquis ad finem obtinendi dignitatem aut beneficia pinguia collatori munera pretiosa donet, absque ullo tamen facto explicito vel implicito, quamvis indecore quidem accipiantur, *absque injustitia tamen retineri possunt*, etiamsi is qui dedit spe sua defraudetur, quia solum data sunt liberaliter ad alliciendum ejus animam et captandam benevolentiam.[1] A little further on he gives a case in some respects analogous to the one in question: "An peccat femina quæ accipit pecuniam ab eo qui dat animo ipsam sollicitandi ad turpia, licet in mente habeat non consentiendi peccato?" He answers as follows: "*Certum mihi est non esse peccatum contra justitiam*, licet animum habeat positivum non consentiendi turpitudini desideratæ, quia acceptio muneris non includit promissionem tacitam vel expressam consentiendi, sed inducit solum obligationem moralem gratitudinis in licitis et honestis.[2]

It may be said: but even though there is no actual contract, does not he who receives a bribe, knowing for what purpose it is offered, co-operate in an injustice against the state, and does he not co-operate in the accomplishment of the sin of bribery?

We answer, no.—Supposing that the law prohibiting bribery of this kind be not merely a penal law, but have such binding force in conscience as to make its violation a positive sin, the mere acceptance of the bribe could not be an injustice against the state, as long as the recipient does not bind himself, nor intends to vote against his conscience. Nor is his accepting the money rightly speaking a co-operation in the sin of him who offers it, for that sin is completed independently of him who accepts, since the acceptance alone is, as we have seen, no violation of justice. "Jam invenitur posita tota culpa et malitia ex parte donantis, qua posita *non apparet quæ culpa sit in acceptione, cum non sit causa*

[1] De Justitia et Jure Disp., 18, sect. 3, n. 49. [2] Ibid., n. 50.

culpæ donantis, sed eam totam jam invenit positam, nec per defectum acceptionis minui potest: ergo nec contra charitatem peccabit." [1]

Nevertheless, the acceptance of a bribe under the circumstances *may* be a sin against charity. For it may give scandal; it may foster and encourage corrupt practices to the detriment of the common good, public morality, etc. De Lugo admits this in the case cited by him: "Negari tamen non potest quod multum deserviat ad fovendam in posterum spem turpem donatoris, et ad tentanda alia media . . . . quam si munera constanter repulsa fuissent." [2]

Practically, however, it must be kept in mind, that the moral bearing of civil legislation and its binding force in conscience are to be largely measured by the end which the particular laws have in view; by the actual harm their violation may do, or the good it may prevent; by the interpretation which universal custom has given to them, etc. And whilst it appears always "indecore" to accept gifts which may be supposed to be offered from sinister or selfish motives, there may nevertheless be instances when their refusal does greater harm. A person may for example provoke enmities which would effectually injure an entire community, etc. Under such conditions, whilst simulation would be a sin, a person might lawfully dissemble, and even be bound to do so from motives of charity.

Furthermore, as the money thus spent is generally taken from funds liberally set aside for the purpose of increasing the popularity of the candidates, and is disbursed independently of personal considerations, there is hardly any danger that he who receives a gift out of the common fund for the purpose of influencing his vote might thereby unjustly deprive another of what belongs to him. Those interested in the elections and disbursing money in the promotion of their claims are likely aware that they run a certain risk in the application of their funds.

[1] De Justitia et Jure Disp., 18, sect. 3, n. 50. [2] Ibid. n. 51.

There are other aspects of the case; however, we believe to have answered the difficulty with the support of sufficient authority to permit its safe, practical application. B. *peccasse* nobis *non* videtur, nisi forte contra charitatem, quod ex circumstantiis particularibus dijudicandum erit.

TITULAR FEASTS IN MAY.

CHURCH OF SS. PHILIP AND JAMES.

(*Seven Churches reported in* 1888.)

Apr. 30, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Maj. 1, Fer. 5. *Rub.* SS. Philippi et Jacobi App. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. et in die Octava fit ut in Calend. pro utroq. Clero cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud et Miss. (except. fest. Invent. S. Crucis) Præf. App. (cum ead. except.) et Cr. Pro 3. Noct. habentur Lectt. special. in Octavar.

II. CHURCH OF ST. PHILIP.

(*Sixteen Churches in* 1888.)

Fest. S. Jacobi perpetuo figend. tanq. Dupl. 2. cl. in 11. Maji, pro *Clero Romano*, in 9. Junii nisi antehac superiori die fuerit fixum.

Apr. 30, Vesp. de seq. Antiph. Vesp. ex Laud. festi, ad Magn. pr. Or. de fest. in singul. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Maj. 1, *Rub.* S. Philippi Ap. Dupl. 1 cl. cum Oct. off. de App. temp. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. de com. App. 2. Noct. 1. pr. 2. et 3. de com. 3. Noct. ex festo Antiph. ad Laud. et Bened. ex festo, reliqua de com. Miss. pr. cum orationibus in singul. In 2. Vesp. Antiph. ex Laud. ad Magn. ut in fest. Com. Seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infra Oct. et in Oct. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. (except. festo S. Cruc.) Præf. App. (cum ead. except.)et Cr.

III. CHURCH OF ST. JAMES THE LESS.

(*One hundred and fifteen Churches in* 1888, *dedicated to St. James; nearly all of them, however, have for Titular St. James the Greater, honored on July* 25th.)

Fest. S. Philipp. perpetuo figendum tanq. Dupl. 2. cl. 11. Maji; *pro Clero Romano,* nisi anterius fuerit fixum, 9. Junii.

Apr. 30, Vesp. de seq. (de com. App.) or. pr. in sing. Nulla com. *Pro Clero Romano,* idem.

Maj. 1. *Rub.* S. Jacobi Ap. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. de App. temp. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. ut in fest. 2. Noct. 1. et 2. pr. 3. de com. App. 3. Noct. et reliqua de com. Miss. *Protexisti* or. pr. in sing. Gl. Cr. Evgl. ex Miss. vot. SS. Petri et Pauli. In 2. Vesp. (de com. App.) com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infra Oct. et in Oct. pro utroq. Cler. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. (except. fest. S. Cruc.) Præf. App. (cum ead. except.) et Cr.

IV. CHURCH OF ST. ATHANASIUS.

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Maj. 1. Vesp. de seq. Com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

2, Fer. 6. *Alb.* S. Athanasii Ep. C. D. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. C. P. rit. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Sapientiam* Miss. pr. cum Gl. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. (except. fest. Invent. S. Cruc.) in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

8, In 2. Vesp. com. Oct. (ut in 1. Vesp.)

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Fest. S. Greg. Naz. perpetuo figend. 11. Maji; *pro Clero Romano,* 9. Junii nisi antehac fuerit fixum.

9, Fer. 6. *Alb.* Oct. S. Athan. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* vel ex Breviar. ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in festo vel ut 26 Januar. *Dominus diem,* Reliq. ut in fest. et pro Vesp. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

V. CHURCH OF THE HOLY CROSS.

(*Fifty-one Churches in* 1888*; among them the Cathedral of Boston.*)

All churches dedicated to the Holy Cross, except those that have for title the Exaltation of the H. Cross, have their Titular feast on the 3d of May.

Maj. 2. Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

3, Sabb. *Rub.* Inventio SS. Crucis D. N. J. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. off. pr. 9. Lect. incip. a verbo *Intendat.* Nihil fit de Simplic. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. et (except. fest. S. Joan.) Præf. Cruc.

9, Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1 Vesp.) com. præc. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Fest. S. Antonini permanent. mutand. in diem seq. *pro Clero Romano,* in 9. Jun. si non antea fuerit prius fixum.

10, Sabb. *Rub.* Oct. Invent. SS. Crucis. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pro hac die vel ut in festo 9. Lectt. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, Omnia ut supra.

11, Dom. 5. post Pasch. *Alb.* S. Antonini Ep. C. Dupl. (fix. ex heri) off. C. P. rit. P. m. et v. et pr. loc. cum 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et seq.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Alexandri ut in Calend.

VI. CHURCH OF ST. MONICA.

(*Nine Churches in* 1888).

Maj. 3, Vesp. de seq. Com. præc. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

4, Dom. 4. post Pasch. *Alb.* S. Monicæ Vid. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. nec V. nec M. rit. P. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Mulierem fortem* 2. et 3. Noct. pr. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. pr. cum Gl. Cr. et Evgl. Dom. in fine. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

5, Fer. 2. S. Pii V. ut in Calend. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Ep. B. Jacob. (ex heri) Com. Oct. in Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. pro utroq. Cler. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss.

10, Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. præc. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Fest. S. Alex. nisi jam antea fixum, permanent. mutand. in 9. Junii.

11, Dom. 5. post Pasch. *Alb.* Oct. S. Monicæ Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duplicia palla* vel ex Breviar. ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in Fer. 5. Hebd. 4. Quadrag. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. (ut in fest.) cum Gl. Cr. et Evgl. Dom. in fine. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VII. CHURCH OF ST. PIUS V.

(*Ten Churches in* 1888.)

Maj. 4, Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

5, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Pii V. Pap. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. C. P. rit. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Fidelis sermo* Miss. *Statuit* cum Gl. et Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. pro utroq. Cler. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. In Domin. omit. com. de Cruce et *Prec.* et dicunt. duæ tant. orationes.

11, Vesp. de seq. com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com Dom. Fest. SS. Nerei et Soc. permanent. mutand. in diem seq. *pro* Clero Romano in 9. Junii nisi jam fuerit anterius fixum.

12, Fer. 2. Rogat. *Alb.* Oct. S. Pii Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Fidelis*

sermo. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Tantum debet* vel ex Breviar. ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Datur unicuique* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et. com. Fer. 2. Rogat. tant. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Evgl. Fer. in fin. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.—Pro reliq. vd. Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. præc.

12, Fer. 3 Rogat. *Rub.* SS. Nerei. A Soc. Mart. (fix. ex heri) semid. Mutat. mutandis ut heri. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. In Miss. 2. or. Rogat. 3. B. M. V. *Concede.* Evgl. S. Joan. in fin. In 2. Vesp. pro iis qui off. vot. utunt. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend.

VIII. CHURCH OF ST. STANISLAS, MARTYR.

(*There are over thirty Churches in the United States reported as dedicated to St. Stanislas and St. Stanislas Kostka. Most of the former, however, have also for title St. Stanislas Kostka, not the Bishop, Martyr.*)

Maj. 6, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Bened. II. perpetuo figend. 13. Maji.

7, Fer. 4. *Rub.* S. Stanislai Ep. M. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. Mart. temp. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* Reliq. ut in Calend. cum Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 5, 6. Sabb. (Dom. etiam. *pro Clero Romano*) ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

11, Dom. 5. post Pasch. *Rub.* ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. tant. Omitt. com. de Cruce et *Prec.*

12, Fer. 2. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Laud. et Miss. ante com. Rogat. Omitt. com. de Cruc. *Prec.* et Or. B. M. V. in Miss. in qua Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

13, Fer. 3. Rogat. *Rub.* De Oct. Gemid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. *Quibus ego vos laudibus.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ego sum vitis* vel ex Breviar. ut in fest. Nulla com. ad Laud.

nec *Prec.* Miss. ut in fest. 2. or. Rogat. 3. B. M. V. Gl. Cr. Vesp. de seq. ut in 1. Vesp. fest. Com. S. Bonif. M.

Pro Clero Romano, Alb. S. Bened. II. Pap. C. Dupl. (fixum ex 7. hujus) ut in Calend. ad ist. diem cum com. Oct. in Laud. et Miss. in qua Gl. Cr. 3. or. Rogat. Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. præc. et S. Bonif. M.—Fest. S. Paschal. perpetuo mutand. in 9. Junii.

14, Fer. 4. Rogat. et Vig. Ascens. *Rub.* Oct. S. Stanislai Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. *a Mileto* 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sumptus ad turrim* vel ex Breviar. ut in fest 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ea de causa,* vel ut in festo 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Vig. et S. Mart. in Laud. Miss. ut in fest. cum Gl. 2. or. Vig. 3. Rogat. 4. S. Mart. Cr. et Evgl. Vig. in fin. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

IX. CHURCH OF ST. ANTONINUS.

(*One Church in* 1888.)

Maj. 10, Fest. celebr. ut Dupl. 1 cl. sine com. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A. Mileto.* Dicit. Cr. per tot. Oct. et fit hujus com. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. fit de Oct. Maj. 13 et 14.

Maj. 17, Oct. S. Anton.—Fest. S. Pasch. Baylon perpetuo mutand. in 21. Maj. et *pro Clero Romano,* fest. S. Joan. Nepom. in 9. Junii nisi antehac prius fuerit fixum. Pro celebr. Octav. Cfr. Octava S. Pii V. supra.

X. CHURCH OF THE ASCENSION.

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Omnia ut in Calend. pro utroq. Clero ad 15. Maji.

XI. CHURCH OF ST. JOHN OF NEPOMUC.

(*Sixteen Churches in* 1888.)

Fest. S. Ubaldi permanenter mutand. in 22. hujus, ubi hoc anno ejus com. tantum. *Pro Clero Romano,* in 17. hujus.

Maj. 15, In 2. Vesp. Com. seq. (or. pr.)

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

16, Fer. 6. *Rub.* S. Joannis Nepom. M. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Off. Mart. temp. Pasch. et pr. loc. (Legend. prius ex duob. off.

in fin. Brev. nisi ubi secund. specialiter concessum). Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* Omit. com. Oct. Miss. *Protexisti* cum Gl. Evgl. *Nihil est opertum* et Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

17, Sabb. S. Pasch. Bayl. ut in Calend. cum com. 2. Octt. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Ep. 2. S. Petri.

Pro Clero Romano, Alb. S. Ubald. Episc. C. Semid. (fix. ex heri) ut in Calend. ad 16. mutatis mutand. com. 2. Octt.

Infr. reliq. hebd. pro utroq. Cler. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

21 et 22, loc. com. S. Joan. Nep. fit com. S. Ubald. hujusq. 9. Lect.

23, Fer. 6. *Rub.* Oct. S. Joan. Nepom. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. ut in Calend. 2. Noct. *Quibus ego vos laudibus.* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct.ex Octavar. *Si tanta est* vel ut in festo. Miss. ut in fest. cum Gl. Cr. et Præf. Ascens. In 2. Vesp. com. Fer. 6. post Oct. Ascens.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Fest. S. J. B. de Rossi mutand. in 9. Junii nisi jam anterius fixum.

XII. CHURCH OF ST. VENANTIUS.

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Maj. 17, Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

18, Dom. infr. Oct. Ascens. *Rub.* S. Venantii M. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. partial. off. Mart. temp. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. tant. in Laud. et Miss. cum reliq. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

19, Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Ep. B. Joan. Ap. (ex heri) Com. 2. Oct. 20, 21, 22 ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Titul.

23, Fer. 6. *Alb.* De Oct. 6. die Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. Inc. Ep. 3. B. Joan. 2. Noct. *Dignum et congruum* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Manentes ergo* vel ut in fest. Com. Fer. 6. post Oct. Ascens. in Laud. et Miss. (ut in fest.) cum Gl. 3. or. B. M. V. *Concede.* Cr. et Præf. Ascens. In 2. Vesp. com. Fer.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.
Hic clauditur Oct. S. Venantii.

XIII. CHURCH OF ST. BERNARDINE OF SIENNA.

(*One Church in* 1888.)

19, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.
Pro Clero Romano, idem.

20, Fer. 3. *Alb.* S. Bernardin. Senens. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. partial off. C. non P. Rit. Pasch. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus si morte* una or. in Laud. Miss. et Vesp. Reliq. ut in Calend.
Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

21 et 22, ut in Calend. cum com. Titul.

23, Fer 6. *Alb.* De Oct. 4. die Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. ut in Calend. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *quantum autem* vel ex Breviar. *Beati* (Bernardini) *dies* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si centuplum* vel ut in fest. Com. Fer. 6. post Oct. Ascens. in Laud. et Miss. (ut in fest.) cum Gl. 3. or. B. M. V. *Concede* Cr. et Præf. Ascens. In 2. Vesp. com. Fer.
Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.
Hic clauditur Octava S. Bernardini.

XIV. CHURCH OF THE HOLY GHOST.

(*Fourteen Churches in* 1888.)

25, Dom. Pentecostes. *Rub.* Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. privil. Omnia ut in Calend. per. totam Octavam pro utroq. Clero.

Any other Titulars that may occur in the month of May after the 23d must this year, on account of the Feast and Octave of Pentecost, be transferred for the common Calendar to the 2d of June, and for the Roman Calendar to the 9th of that month. Among them are the B. Virgin, Help of Christians, St. Mary Magdalene de Pazzi, (fix. June 8. in Rom. Calend.) St. Philip Neri, and St. Augustine of Canterbury.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

The Preface of a "Transferred" Patron.

When the solemn celebration of the Patronal feast of a church is transferred to the following Sunday, the preface, unless the Patron have one which is proper, is to be *de SS. Trinitate* or *de tempore.*

S. R. C. die 10 Feb. 1888, in Nanneten.

"Churching" the Mother of a Child that has Died without Baptism.

Qu. A woman whose child has died without Baptism comes to be churched. In the form *Benedictio mulieris post partum* occur the words: Præsta ut post hanc vitam ad æternæ beatitudinis præmia *cum prole sua* pervenire mereatur.—1st. Is the woman to be churched? 2d. What form is to be used, since the prayer of the Ritual seems in this case to contain a useless petition, as the child cannot attain to the *æternæ beatitudinis præmia.*

Resp. The S. C. decides that the woman is to be churched, and that the ordinary form, without change or omission, is to be used. As the latter admits of a wider interpretation than the one implied in the above question, there appears no reason for hesitating about its use.

DUBIUM.

Consueverunt mulieres post partum coram sacerdote se sistere pro benedictione accipienda, etiamsi proles mortua fuerit quandoque sine Baptismo. In illo tamen casu verba orationum Ritualis Romani . . . . . verificari non possunt, et aliunde benedictio non omitteretur sine aliqua admiratione plebis, et sine aggravatione mœroris mulierum hujusmodi. Quæritur quid agendum, et utrum liceat, demptis iis, quæ non verificantur, postquam mulier in ecclesiam introducta foret, substituta aliqua oratione ex iis, quæ in Missali continentur, benedictionem prout in Rituali impertiri?

Resp. Servandum omnino Rituale Romanum.

S. R. C. die 12 Sept. 1857.
n. 5251 ad XX.

Indulgences of the "Agnus Dei."

Qu. Are the Indulgences attached to the "Agnus Dei" as blessed by the Sovereign Pontiff, (i. e. pieces of wax, several inches in diameter, with the form of a lamb imprinted upon them) also applied in the case of the small particles into which these larger pieces are divided and made into various forms of hearts, etc.? All the authorities which I have consulted speak only of the large form, and seem to require the image of the lamb expressed upon it as an essential feature of the "Agnus Dei."

Resp. It is an error to suppose that there are indulgences attached to the "Agnus Dei," whether large or small. If any author mentions such, they are not authentic. The benedictions of the Church as imparted by the Sovereign Pontiff through the prayers and invocations which he pronounces in blessing the pure wax taken from the Paschal candle give a certain virtue to the same, by which those who devoutly wear a portion of it are protected from physical and moral evils, such a sickness, unforeseen dangers, temptation, and the like.

That the same virtue is attached to the small particles of wax which are enveloped in figures of hearts and the like, made of silk or other material, that they might be more conveniently worn by the faithful, appears from a note of Gardellini, who, speaking of the blessing of the Paschal candle, says: "Olim dispertiebantur populo particulæ Cerei Paschalis ad suffumigandum una cum thure, pio ac religioso animo ad avertenda mala, bonaque postulanda. Est ea secundaria Cerei Paschalis institutionis causa. Quemadmodum vero substituti fuerunt *cerei Agnus Dei* ad excitandam retinendamque baptismi memoriam in recenter baptizatis, et pro cereo Paschali sive hujus particula parvi Cerei ipsis dabantur,

ita et Cerei *Agnus Dei* post modum pro Cerei magni particula et pro parvis cereis populo distribui cœperunt, et præcipuo fini, qui fuit in illorum institutione, ut Deus illis utentibus mala averteret, etc.[1]

The Absolutio Post Missam de Requie.

Qu. Can a priest who has not sung the Mass "de Requie" give the *absolution* after it, especially if he is to preach on the occasion?

Resp. The "absolution" should be given by the celebrant of the Mass himself, except in the case where a Bishop is present at the obsequies, when the latter may give the absolution, although he did not say the Mass.

DUBIUM.

Juxta Decretum S. R. Congregationis die 12 Augusti 1854 in Briocen. solus Episcopus jure gaudet absolvendi post missam in die obitus, quin illam celebraverit et per Decretum die 21 Julii 1855 in Briocen. declaratum: Congruum esse ut absolutio fiat ab ipso sacerdote qui missam celebravit, non ab alio diverso. Quum non una sit sententia sacerdotum Diœcesis Bajonen. circa sensum harum declarationum; idcirco sacram Congregationem enixe rogat orator ut certam indubiamque præfinire dignetur rationem, per quam errandi libertas auferatur.

Sacra porro eadem Congregatio, referente infrascripto Secretario audito voto in scriptis alterius ex Apostolicarum Cæremoniarum Magistris, propositis dubiis rescribendum censuit:

Congruum est ut absolutio fiat ab ipso celebrante juxta Decretum in Briocen. die 21 Julii 1855, nisi adsit Episcopus, juxta alias Decreta. Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit die 25 Septembris 1875.

(Decr. auth. 5637, ad VII.)

[1] Cf. Muehlbauer, Decreta, vol. I., Cereus Pasch.

The Clergy in the Sanctuary Genuflecting during Ferial Masses.

Qu. The clergy who are in the Sanctuary (in choro), except Prelates and Chanters, genuflect in ferial masses during Lent, Advent, Quartertenses (except Pentecost) and on all but the privileged Vigils of Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas, from the "Sanctus" to the "Pax Domini." So say the Rubrics of the Missal. Does this mean to the "Pax Domini" *inclusive* or *exclusive*?

Resp. It means to the "Pax Domini" inclusive, that is, the Master of Ceremonies gives the sign for the clergy to rise, after the celebrant has finished singing the "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum."

DUBIUM.

Ex Rubricis Generalibus Missalis Tit. XVII n. 5 in Missis Feriarum Adventus, etc., genuflectere debent omnes in choro; dicto per celebrantem *Sanctus* usque ad *Pax Domini*; quæritur utrum haec rubrica intelligenda sit usque ad *Pax Domini* inclusive vel exclusive?

S. R. C. resp. Inclusive usque ad Pax Domini per celebrantem.

Die 29 Dec. 1884 (Decr. auth. 5929 ad XI.)

Blessing of the Baptismal Font on the Eve of Pentecost.

We referred last year to a comparatively recent decree of the S. Congregation of Rites (Cf. American Eccl. Review, 1889, p. 155), stating that the blessing of the Font on the Eve of Pentecost is obligatory. We call attention to the clause in this decree which says that all custom to the contrary is to be eliminated "non obstante quacumque contraria consuetudine, quæ omnino eliminari debet."

On the day before the blessing, the Font is emptied and cleaned, (some water being reserved for cases of necessity

which may occur in the mean time; which water is afterwards thrown into the sacrarium). For the Blessing the same rite is observed as on Holy Saturday, except the omission of the *Flectamus Genua*.

ANALECTA.

EX S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROP. FIDE.

Privileges accorded to priests participating in the work of the Propagation of the Faith.

The "Annales de la Propagation de la Foi," num. 367, Nov. 1889, bring the following letter and Pontifical Rescript, by which certain privileges are accorded to priests who take part in the work. We give the original text in French, as the document has already been fully explained in another part of this number.

Très Saint Père,

Les Présidents des Conseils centraux de l'Oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi, humblement prosternés aux pieds de Votre Sainteté, La supplient instamment de daigner accorder à perpétuité les faveurs et facultés enoncées ci-dessous aux prêtres qui serviront la dite Oeuvre dans les conditions exprimées ci-après, à savoir:

1. A tout prêtre qui sera chargé dans une paroisse ou dans un établissement de recueillir des aumônes pour l'Oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi, quelle que soit d'ailleurs la somme qu'il recueille, ou qui de ses propres ressources versera dans la caisse de l'Oeuvre le produit d'une dizaine entière:

1° La faveur de l'autel privilégié trois fois par semaine.

2° Le pouvoir d'appliquer les indulgences suivantes: aux fidèles qui sont à l'article de la mort, l'indulgence plénière; aux chapelets ou rosaires, croix, crucifix, images, statuettes et médailles, les indulgences apostoliques; aux chapelets, les indulgences dites de sainte Brigitte.

3° La faculté d'attacher aux crucifix les indulgences du Chemin de la Croix.

II. A tout prêtre membre d'un Conseil ou d'un Comité chargé de veiller aux intérêts de l'Oeuvre, etc.

A tout prêtre qui, dans l'année, aura versé à la caisse de l'Oeuvre une somme répresentant au moins le produit de mille souscriptions, quelle que soit d'ailleurs la provenance de cette somme :

1° Les mêmes faveurs que les prêtres de la catégorie précédente.

2° La faveur de l'autel privilégié personnel cinq fois par semaine.

3° La faveur de bénir les croix en y attachant les indulgences appliqués à l'exercice du Chemin de la Croix, et de plus le pouvoir d'imposer le cordon et le scapulaire séraphiques avec toutes les indulgences et les privilèges accordés a cette imposition par les Souverains Pontifes.

4° Le pouvoir de bénir et d'imposer aux fidèles les scapulaires du Mont-Carmel, de l'Immaculée-Conception et de la Passion de Notre-Seigneur.

Dans le cas où les sommes à recueillir seraient momentanément incomplètes, les susdits Présidents implorent de Votre Sainteté la prorogation des pouvoirs du prêtre qui aura fait deversement intégral de l'année précédente, jusqu'à la clôture le l'exercice courant.

III. Tout prêtre qui versera en une fois de ses propres ressources une somme représentant le produit de mille souscriptions aura droit toute sa vie aux faveurs accordées aux prêtres membres d'un Conseil.

Ex Audientia SSmi habita die 4 (5 ?) *Augusti* 1889.

SSmus Dominus noster Leo divina Providentia PP. XIII, referente me infrascripto Archiepiscopo Tyren., S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, expetitas extensiones indulgentiarum concedere dignatus est, easque in perpetuum pio operi tribuit, excepta facultate benedicendi coronas, quam non ultra quinquennium concessit.

Datum Romæ ex ædibus dictæ Congregationis die et anno ut supra.

L. S. Pro R. P. D. Secretario,
PHILIPPUS BORRONI, substitutus.

EX S. CONG. INDULGENTIARUM.

By the following Decree the Sovereign Pontiff grants to all the faithful who on fifteen successive Saturdays devoutly recite at least five decades of the Rosary (or otherwise honor the sacred mysteries of the Rosary) an *Indulgence of seven years and seven times forty days* for each of the fifteen Saturdays, and a *Plenary Indulgence* once during that time, under the usual conditions of Confession, H. Communion, and prayer for the Sovereign Pontiff. These Indulgences are likewise applicable to the Souls in Purgatory.

DECRETUM

Urbis et Orbis; quo conceditur Indulgentia Christifidelibus pium exercitium quindecim Sabbathorum in honorem Deiparæ sub titulo Sanctissimi Rosarii peragentibus.

Pluribus abhinc annis Sodales Confraternitatum SSi Rosarii consueverunt singulare pietatis obsequium Bmæ Mariæ Virgini tribuere quindecim Sabbathis, haud interruptis, vel immediate ante festum ejusdem B. Mariæ Virginis sub memorato titulo, vel etiam quolibet infra annum tempore. Hæc autem pia praxis sacris jam Indulgentiis a summis Pontificibus pro supradictis tantummodo sodalibus ditata, in eo sita est, ut nempe singulis præfatis Sabbathis sodales accedant ad sacramenta Confessionis et SS. Eucharistiæ, simulque aliquem devotionis actum eliciant in honorem quindecim Mysteriorum, quæ recensentur in marialibus precibus SSi Rosarii. Modo vero quum apud Christifideles usus exhibendi hujusmodi obsequium B. Mariæ Virgini frequentissimus invaluerit, preces delatæ sunt SS. Domino Nostro Leoni Papæ XIII, ut etiam Christifidelibus devote peragen-

tibus hoc pium exercitium cœlestes Indulgentiarum thesauros benigne reserare dignaretur. Porro Sanctitas sua, cui summopere cordi est, ut erga B. Virginem sub titulo SS. Rosarii cultus foveatur et pietas, relatas preces in audientia habita die 21 Septembris 1889 ab infrascripto Secretario S. Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis præpositæ peramanter excepit et, alia quæcumque abrogata Indulgentia, quæ fortasse pro universis Christifidelibus eidem pio exercitio quomodolibet fuerit adnexa, omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus, qui in singulis haud interruptis quindecim Sabbathis vel immediate præcedentibus idem festum B. Mariæ Virginis sub titulo SS. Rosarii, vel etiam quolibet infra annum tempore vere pœnitentes, confessi ac sacra Communione refecti, tertiam saltem SS. Rosarii partem devote recitaverint, vel aliter ejusmodi SS. Rosarii mysteria pie recoluerint, *Plenariam Indulgentiam*, defunctis quoque applicabilem, semel tantum in uno ex supradictis Sabbathis uniuscujusque arbitrio eligendo, benigne concessit; in reliquis vero quatuordecim Sabbathis *Indulgentiam septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum* animabus pariter in Purgatorio detentis applicabilem, clementer elargitus est. Præsenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Datum Romæ ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 21 Sept. 1889.

Pro Emo ac Rmo Dno C. Card. CRISTOFORI, Præfecto,
ALOISIUS Card. Episcopus SABINENSIS.
ALEXANDER Episc. Oensis, Secretarius.

FROM THE INDEX LIBRORUM.

We subjoin some of the principal works placed on the Index Librorum, since December 1886, which circulate in this country, and which Catholics are prohibited from reading or circulating on account of the errors or the dangerous tendency which they contain in regard to faith and morals.

G. Hahn, S. J., Professeur de physiologie au Collège de la Comp. de Jésus à Louvain. Bruxelles, Alfred Vromant, imprimeur éditeur, 1883. *Les Phénomènes Histériques et les Révélations de Sainte Thérèse.*

Decr. S. Rit. C. Die 1 Dec. 1885.

The author retracted his erroneous opinions and censured his work.

Decr. 11 Jan. 1886.

Henri Des Houx. *Souvenir d'un Journaliste Français à Rome.* Paris, Paul Ollendorf, éditeur. 1886.

Decr. 1 Apr. 1886.

The author retracted and censured his work.

Decr. 25 Jan. 1886.

Casus Moralis. Pisis, 1886. Typ. Mariotti. Dec. S. Off. Fer. IV. die 15 Sept. 1886.

Decr. 31 Dec. 1886.

G. B. Savarese, auctor opusculi cujus titulus: *La scommunica di un' idea.—Riposta al Card. Vicario di Roma.*

Dec. S. Off. Fer. IV. die 26 Nov. 1884.

The author retracted and censured his work.

Decr. 14 Dec. 1886.

Le Pape et l Allemagne.—Rome, Typogr. Rue Arcione, 111, 1 Mar. 1887.

Decr. 10 Mar. 1887.

Henri Lasserre. *Les Saints Evangiles, traduction nouvelle.* Paris, 1887.

François Lenormant. *Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux.—De la création de*

l'homme au déluge. Vol. I.— *L'humanité nouvelle et la dispersion des peuples.* Vol. II. 1880–1882–1883.

The author, before his death, retracted everything in his works that may be found censurable in the judgment of the Church.

Decr. 19 Dec. 1887.

Augusto Pierantoni, Professore ordinario della R. Università di Roma. *Trattato di diritto internazionale.* Vol. I. Prolegomeni. Sloria dell' antichità al 1400. Roma. Forzani e C., tipogr. del Senato.

Decr. 14 Dec. 1888.

Roma e l Italia e la realtà delle cose, pensieri di un Prelato Italiano. Opusculo estratto dalla Rassegna Nazionale an. XI., Vol. XLVI., 1 Mar. 1889. Firenze.

Decr. 13 Apr. 1889.

Il Rosmini Enciclopedia di Scienze e Lettere redatta da un Consiglio di Direzione composto di Scrittori accreditati nei diversi rami del sapere. Milano. Decr. S. Off. Fer. IV. die 29, Mai. 1889.

Decr. 14 June 1889.

Jean de Bonnefon. *Le Pape de demain.* Paris, E. Dentu. 1889. Decr. S. Off. die 14 Junii 1889.

Decr. 4 Dec. 1889.

LIBRARY TABLE.

ANALECTA JURIS PONTIFICII. Roma. XXVIII. Ser. CCLI. Livr.

The number opens with an account of the introductory process of the *Canonization* of Princess Louise, in religion, Sister *Thérèse de S. Augustin*, who died in the odor of sanctity in a Carmelite Convent of Saint

Dénis in 1787. The process of Beatification had been begun in 1685. The traditions of her community and the contemporary history attesting her extraordinary virtues cover an immense field. They consist mainly of ancient manuscript chronicles kept in the monastery of Autun, where the nuns, who had lived seventeen years with the saint, went after the restoration in France. There are also a great number of letters and memorials written by those who had known her personally. Some 700 letters were presented to the H. Father, coming from eminent persons, asking to have the cause introduced. Among these the first is from the hand of the Count De Chambord, a lineal descendant of the royal house to which the holy Princess belonged. She was the daughter of Louis XV., king of France, and the noble Mary Leszczinska. At her baptism, which she received on the day of her birth, she was called Aloysia Maria. Even as an infant she was intrusted to the care of the nuns at the royal abbey Fontevrault, where at the age of eight she received the Sacrament of Confirmation and her first H. Communion. At fourteen she returned to court Accounts which we have here give a brief but lovely picture of her gentle yet withal fervent disposition. At sixteen she happened to be present at the reception of the Carmelite habit by a young noblewoman, and forthwith the desire to spend her life in religion took hold of her. Her delicate health and her mother's wishes prevented her for years from carrying out the most cherished desire of her heart. On April 11th 1770, at the age of thirty-three, she felt herself free to leave the court of Versailles and cast herself into the arms of her longed-for Spouse. She died seventeen years later the most precious of deaths, and the instinct of those who had loved her in life sought and found her aid after her death. "Deus operatur miracula ad demonstrandam sanctitatem alicujus quem vult proponere in exemplum virtutum." S. Thom. II., 2, qu. 28, art. 1.

The final portion of the treatise *Doctorat de S. Alphonse* deals with the ascetical works of the Saint and their practical value. It establishes, with reference to what has been previously argued, the solidity of the dogmatic and moral doctrine of St. Alphonsus, and points to his efficient administration as bishop and religious founder as a conclusive proof of this. The conclusion is a magnificent piece of work, both in point of style, every line betraying the Tullian power and harmonious movement of thought and expression, and also as a summing up of the entire argument. "Satis multa mihi videor dixisse, ut objecta omnia, quæ dili-

gentia censoris sollertissimi contra eminentem S. Alphonsi doctrinam reperire potuit, refutarem prorsus atque diluerem. Sed antequam orationi finem imponam, liceat mihi, ad instar viatoris longum iter emensi per amœna et florentia vireta, consistere paulisper et ea respiciendo quæ pulcherrima visa sunt, nonnihil ab exantlato labore recreari." One is strongly reminded of the defense "Pro Archia pœta" in the very words the author uses to set forth the eminent gifts of his holy client and withal patron. "Tanta autem vis ingenii, tanta dicendi facultas in eo eluxit, ut legentes jucundissime alliciat et in sui admirationem rapiat. Utilitas demum ex illius scriptis tanta obvenit universo populo christiano, ut nulla pars sit catholici orbis, in qua mentes complurium non illustrarit, vel corda non moverit ad colendam virtutem, et ad charitatem non incenderit." As examples the writer cites the doctrine of the saint in regard to the vexed question of *gratia efficax* and *gratia sufficiens;* the book on the *glories of Mary;* his defence of the *Primacy* and Infallibility; his exposition of the system of *æquiprobabilism*, etc., all of which works prove that he has a just claim to the title of Doctor Ecclesiae.

The article *Le Concile de Trente et la Coutume* is a rather severe stricture of the teaching of Mgr. Santi, who has since died, in his work on Canon Law published a few years ago. Santi, it appears, maintained that, although the Council of Trent had abrogated previous customs contrary to the Canons of the universal Church, new customs might in course of time obtain the force of law against the decrees of Trent. The writer in the Analecta shows that this opinion is directly opposed to the constant teaching of unquestionable authorities in the whole range of ecclesiastical jurisprudence.

The *Mélanges Liturgiques* bring the continuation of decisions of the S. Congregation, beginning with Sept. 1882, to Jan. 1884. Some of these have already been published in the *Am. Eccl. Review*.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA-LAACH. Freiburg Brisg. xxxviii. 3.

"The Pedagogy of Our divine Lord" is an interesting study of the gospel narrative. It brings out the characteristic qualities of Christ as a teacher and examines His methods and His success. The author, Father Meschler, S. J., shows how the requisites of a good teacher, namely, authority, love, prudence, and disinterestedness are marked features in the personality of Our Lord. He then points out His methods. The true and right art of educating keeps principally four things in

view : the end and aim of the education which is to be imparted ; the nature and character of the pupil ; the special means at the command of the teacher, and the manner in which they are to be employed to attain their proper object. The author shows how Our Lord, in following out the fundamental principles of education for heaven, adapts himself to the different characters and stations of His hearers. With the poor He is gentle, forbearing, seeks them out and anticipates their needs. With the princes and great ones of the earth He is reserved until they approach Him, then He fulfils their wishes kindly and simply, without allowing any show of extraordinary gratitude. Beautiful is the manner in which the writer draws out Our Lord's conduct towards Nicodemus. He makes the learned scribe feel his inferiority as a teacher, yet there is a cordial forbearance in the manner in which He reproves him. But these features of Our Lord's life must be thoughtfully studied to be appreciated. The manner in which He trains His apostles is especially fruitful inasmuch as it points out how, whilst teaching them all, He educates them separately. Finally the writer points to the success of Our Lord's method. God is the teacher of mankind for all times. His methods are essentially efficient. They who abandon themselves to His guidance become the most perfect, often from having been the most wretched sinners. But Our Lord as an educator counts failures also. They are many, and come where we least expect them, as in the case of Judas. Still, where the seed fell on good ground, where the Master's loving lesson called forth the sweet acknowledgment: Rabboni—mine, there it lasted, aye, and produced fruits such as no secular education can ever hope to bring forth.

Of similar character as the above is an excellent review of a number of writings on the subject of pedagogy by Overberg, Fénelon, St. Jerome, Alcuin, and Hrabanus Maurus, part of an educational series published by Ferd. Schœningh of Paderborn.

BOOK REVIEW.

ALLÈGRE: IMPEDIMENTORUM MATRIMONII SYNOPSIS. Ad usum seninariorum. 4. Ed. Paris and Lyons. 1889. (122 pag.)

The fact that the author, Canon Allègre, has made his studies under the best Roman canonists, Santi, De Angelis, Roncetti, leads us *a*

priori to expect to find this an excellent work. The favorable reception accorded the little work upon its first appearance, in 1885, the laudatory criticism bestowed upon it by competent judges in France, Germany, and Italy, and the appearance of four editions within so short a time, can only tend to strengthen our expectation. And, indeed, after an attentive perusal we must say, that the orderly and logical exposition, as well as the easy, flowing, and withal extremely precise language have impressed us very favorably. This favorable impression is, no doubt, due also in part to the quotations from various authors and ecclesiastical documents, in which the work abounds. In fact, the learned canon shows that he is perfectly familiar with the works of others bearing upon his subject, also with such as have appeared outside of France, and thoroughly conversant with the decisions of the Church touching the many important points of matrimony. Space forbids our entering into details. Suffice it to say, that the subject-matter of the work is the same as that to be found in our ordinary compendiums in the treatise de Matrimonio; the form, however, is quite different; the author has avoided the cut-and-dried form of the class-book, adopted a lively and pleasing style, and thus produced a very readable work.

A few remarks may be of interest to our readers. On page 45 Allègre informs us, upon the authority of Papp-Szilagyi, that the Greeks do not regard the eighth degree of consanguinity or affinity according to the reckoning of the Roman civil law, which, as is well known, obtains throughout the Oriental Church, or the fourth degree according to canon law, as an impedimentum dirimens, and that marriages within this degree are contracted without a dispensation. This is perfectly true; Mansella (S. C. de Prop. Fide pro Rituum Orientalium negotiis Officialis, etc., De Impedimentis Matr. dir., Romæ, 1881, p. 38) tells us the same thing. The practice is tolerated rather than approved of by the Holy See. Rome has repeatedly endeavored to enforce throughout the Oriental church the observance of this general law in its entire extension. The proofs are to be found in the Collectio Lacensis, Vol. II. (pp. 163, 172, 330, 422, 440, 448, 476, 517). These efforts proved successful only among the Maronites and the few Greeks in Italy, the so-called Italo-Græci, to be met with chiefly in Southern Italy and Sicily, and numbering about 60,000. As regards the remaining Greeks and other Orientals, it was deemed advisable, owing to unfavorable circumstances, to urge them no further in this matter. Not even the letter of

Innocent IV. to Otto, Cardinal-legate at Cyprus, was published. (Coll. Lac. II. p. 448.) A small number of Greek-Catholics have also found their way into our own country. Three Greek-Catholic parishes have been formed in the diocese of Scranton, Pa. They are composed of emigrants from Hungary and other eastern parts of Austria, the home of some 7,000,000 Greeks,—those of Bosnia and Herzegovina not included,—of whom 4,000,000 are in union with Rome, the remaining 3,000,000 being schismatics. As on the one hand these members of the Catholic Church in the East observe rites differing considerably from the Latin rite of the West, and as in matters of jurisprudence, too, they are not in full accord with the Roman canon law, as appears from the example given by Allègre; and as on the other hand the Roman Pontiffs have again and again insisted upon the retention of these rites, and have forbidden the transition from one rite to another (Cfr. Zitelli: Apparatus juris eccl. Romæ 1886. p. 247–260), it follows that we also must take these facts into consideration in our dealings with such of these people as have taken up their abode among us. One or the other of our priests, engaged in the practical work of the ministry, may therefore find it desirable or necessary to make himself acquainted with the peculiarities of these people. To such a one we would recommend, as a safe guide, a work written by the learned and zealous Greek-Romanian bishop of Grosswardein, Hungary, Mgr. Jos. Papp-Szilagyi, and published at the beginning of his episcopal career under the title "Enchiridion juris Ecclesiæ orientalis catholicæ." Magno Varadinæ, 1862. 8°. An extract of that portion of the bishop's work which concerns the impediments of matrimony and other matrimonial affairs, may be found in Mansella.

In addition we beg to be allowed to express our opinion on one or the other point of the learned canon's work. On page 57 he says that it is doubtful whether the impedimentum publicæ honestatis arises from the sponsalia privata, and on page 62 he likewise puts it down as doubtful whether the impedimentum criminis neutro machinante arises from a matrimonium civile attentatum, supposito adulterio. We think that there are reasons sufficiently certain to oblige us to give a decidedly affirmative answer to both these questions; for the former we refer to Lehmkuhl, II., n. 765; Konings, n. 1593, qu. 2; Marc. 2043.; Bucceroni: Enchiridion morale, p. 163; for the latter we refer to Feije, n. 784.; Marc, 2036; Aertnys: Theol. mor., vol. II., p. 321, qu. 8°; and

De Angelis, Vol. III., p. 139, where the arguments and positive decisions bearing upon the two questions will be found. Finally, on page 64, where there is question of impedimentum criminis uno machinante, we would like to see mention made of the opinio probabilis of St. Alphonsus (lib. VI., n. 1036, ad 6), according to which, to incur this impediment, it is necessary that the machinans should manifest the intentio matrimonii to the compars by some external means or other, and that, too, præcedenter ad occasionem, not merely post factum, as some think. There are times when a confessor is glad to be able to extricate himself from an embarrassment or help himself out of a difficulty by means of a probable opinion; especially when, as in the present case, a dispensation is not easily granted, and recourse must be had to Rome, as our bishops have no faculties for such a case.

These remarks are by no means intended to detract in any way from the merits of the work under consideration. On the contrary, we repeat that we regard it as most useful not only for students of theology, but also for pastors and missionaries, some of whom, we feel sure, will find much in the book that will seem new to them.

J. P.

READING AND THE MIND WITH SOMETHING TO READ.
By Rev. J. F. X. O'Conor, S. J.

This, together with another pamphlet, "Books and Reading," which we noticed on a previous occasion, are publications of incalculable value and need be placed in the hands of readers young and old. It is quite impossible to stay the torrent of noxious literature which sweeps incessantly over the land and threatens to carry away our younger generation. To speak and write against the evil influences of bad and indifferent literature is useless, unless we systematically educate our people by the adoption of safety rules, such as are here laid down, and by pointing out what is to be read. Happily a movement has begun in that direction, and the clergy everywhere can hardly find it to their interest to be slow in encouraging it by every means at their command.

But speaking of young readers, who are to form a taste and a judgment in the matter of reading, and for whom the pages of this book are mainly designed, we cannot refrain from urging a caution which Fr. O'Conor in a measure anticipates but deprecates. This is in regard to the reading of Ruskin, whom, aside of Newman, we find repeatedly set

forth as the model in prose, and this both on account of his principles and of his style (pag. 41). It were useless here to go over the reasons which Fr. O'Conor sufficiently intimates as being conscious of when he admits certain objections made by eminent critics against an author who is apt, even more than Newman, to carry one away in the reading of his books. His great strength, aside of the varied beauty of his style, lies, as the author shows, in his suggestiveness. "There is no author that I have ever read can so make me pause over a page and see new and newer thoughts come rolling in and raising the mind in an ecstasy of wonder at the power of suggestion which one mind can exert over another" (pag. 23). This is unquestionably true of men whose minds have been trained to reflection, whose instincts are towards right, and who have reached the well-formed maturity which has power to direct the imagination. With such, whilst nearly all their reading turns to their advantage, the suggestiveness of Ruskin is especially fruitful. But it is very different with the young, or with those less robust minds whose strength lies in their feelings—and they are perhaps the very ones whom Ruskin would most fascinate, not by reason of his suggestiveness, but by the beautiful extravagance which is the cause of reflection with other men. In the forty years or more which have elapsed between his first edition of "Modern Painters" and the last, Ruskin has changed his views on the subject of art considerably, and it may be much safer to read him to-day than it was formerly. We have stood and gazed at the Turner gallery with the best intention in the world of profiting by the critic's revelations about the superiority of the new over the old masters—but the cartoons of Kensington kept their fascination in spite of our endeavors, and we should regret to think that with all that is admirable in Ruskin he should succeed in impressing upon the minds of our youth the correctness of his canons and principles in art. Let *men* read him by all means—but to the rest he must be given in choice portions and under supervision. This is a long critique for a small book; yet we consider Father O'Connor's pamphlet a very important one, and the size of a volume is not an index of the notice it merits.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S CHURCH. Kalamazoo, Mich. 1890.

St. Augustine's is a model parish if we may judge from the way in which this "Parish Book" is arranged. The prudent ways of financial administration and the orderly ways of perfect organization, so as to cover all the interests of the people, whose salvation depends in a

manner on their pastors, are things that are hardly touched upon in the curriculum of Seminary study, yet they are extremely important. Father O'Brien and his clergy have thrown considerable light upon the subject by allowing this "Parish Book" to go abroad.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of Books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

DE PRÆCIPUIS CIVIUM CHRISTIANORUM OFFICIIS. Litteræ Encyclicæ Leonis XIII. Deutsch u. Latein.—Herder. 1890. St. Louis, Mo.

CURSUS SCRIPTURÆ SACRÆ, auctoribus B. Cornely, I. Knabenbauer, Fr. de Hummelauer aliisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris: COMMENTARIUS IN EZECHIELEM PROPHETAM, auctore Jos. Knabenbauer, S. J.—Parisiis. P. Lethielleux (Pustet & Co.) 1890. pp. 542.

LECTIONARIUM. Die Episteln und Evangelien der Sonn-u. Festtage aus dem Rœmischen Messbuche uebersetzt von Dr. Jacob Ecker. —Trier: Paulinus Druckerei. 1889.

LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES SIRE, S. J. A simple Biography compiled from his writings and the testimony of those who have known him best. By his Brother Rev. Vital Sire. Transl. from the French.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

EXEMPLAR ACTORUM FORENSIUM quibus inquirendum est de matrimonii nullitate ex capite impotentiæ ac de matrimonii rati et non consummati diremptione, auctore Corolo Sagnori, in Romana Curia advocato.—Romæ: ex typogr. Pacis. MDCCCLXXXIX.

OFFICIA RECENTIORA VOTIVA PER ANNUM pro singulis hebdomadæ feriis.—Romæ: ex Typogr. Tiberinæ. 1890.

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the N. Y. Cath. Protectory to the Legislature of the State and to the Common Council of New York.—West Chester: Printed at the N. Y. Catholic Protectory. 1890.

COLLECTIO RERUM LITURGICARUM, quæ in sacro ministerio sæpius occurrunt, curante Jos. Wuest, C. SS. R.—Neo Eboraci, Cincin., Chicago: Benziger Fratr. 1889.